LEVEL ONE

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

September 1919 Vol. 6 No. 1

Editorial Comment - - - - 3

On Taking the Whole Thing - - - 11
J. G. H. Barry

Psychological Barriers to Reunion - - 21
Hamilton Schuyler

Our Czecho-Slovak Neighbors - - - 28
Thomas J. Lacey

Peter, Therefore, Was Kept in Prison - - 33
Maurice Picard

Prayer Book Revision and the Mission Church - 40
Marshall M. Day

The Kenotic Theory - - - - 48
Albert Farr

Apocalyptic Literature in the Bible - - 62
Arthur Chase

Some Early Commencements - - - 72
Arthur Whipple Jenks

The Sources of the Coverdale Bible - - 85
E. de S. Juny

Book Reviews - - - - - 91

Application now pending for entry as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J.

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 42 Albany Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
OFFICES: 42 ALBANY STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

"Dr. Barry's book presents the true Christian attitude toward the departed — based upon the Catholic doctrine of the Communion of Saints."—Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D.

—From the *Living Church,* August 16, 1919.

ON PRAYERS TO THE DEAD

By Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D.

---

162 Pages,
Library Binding . . $1.25

"As Christians have turned to Christian Science because we neglected the ministry of healing, and Socialism because we have ignored the social teaching of the Gospel, so are they turning to Spiritualism because we have failed to set forth the meaning of the Communion of Saints. Dr. Barry's book is an admirable exposition of that great and glorious doctrine."—The Bishop of Milwaukee.

"Dr. Barry approaches the subject of Invocation of the Saints in a refreshing and straightforward manner . . . . there is a solid backing of learning behind the confessedly controversial style of this admirable little book."—*Church Times,* July 25, 1919.

EDWIN S. GORHAM, *Publisher*
NEW YORK

BOOKS FREE FOR THE POSTAGE

To Ministers, Students for the Ministry, and Foreign Missionaries

BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

Any or all of the following three cloth-bound volumes will be forwarded to any minister, theological student, or foreign missionary, who will send us 15c. to cover mailing cost for each book, without further cost or obligation of any sort.

Arcana Cœlestia, Vol. 1

Takes up the first nine chapters of Genesis, verse by verse, and brings out the eternal or spiritual meaning that lies within the literal story. It helps greatly in making clear the account of the Creation, of the Garden of Eden and of the Flood, and strengthens one's belief in the Holy Bible as the very Word of God.

585 pages. Postage, 15 cents.

Heaven and Its Wonders, and Hell

Gives a clear and rational explanation of the nature of death, of man's entrance into the spiritual world, and of the organization of that world and of the life therein. These presentations are in harmony with the teachings of Holy Scripture.

350 pages. Postage, 15 cents.

Divine Love and Wisdom

Treats of the creation of the universe. Explains the trinity in God.

277 pages. Postage, 15 cents.

We act as Distributing Agents for these books, and can unreservedly recommend them as of great value in your work. In order to secure these books enclose currency or stamps and address Department C,

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

EAST WASHINGTON SQUARE PHILADELPHIA

SUNDAY SCHOOLS

must provide immediately for autumn needs. The new Prospectus and Order Blanks of the

Christian Nurture Series

are now ready, as also is our Catalogue of Church and Sunday School Supplies. These, with announcements of new books for Sunday School workers, will be supplied free on request to

Morehouse Publishing Company

1801 Fond du Lac Ave. Milwaukee, Wis.

THE NEW HYMNAL

With Both Words and Music

"The book contains hymns adapted to different temperaments. There are hymns of stern simplicity and hymns of exuberant devotion; hymns of objective adoration and hymns which unburden the singer's heart and tell what God has done for him alone. Out of the book all types of parishes ought to find expression for their praise."

It is offered to Churches in lots of 100 or more at $1.05 per copy plus carriage charges on an extended payment plan.

THE ABRIDGED HYMNAL

(The 100 Most Used Hymns)

Sold for 25 cents per copy plus carriage charges.

Published Through

The Church Pension Fund

14 Wall Street

New York City

Agents

The H. W. Gray Company

2 West 45th Street

New York City

The American Church Monthly

A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION
42 Albany St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: George A. Armour, Princeton, N. J.
Vice-President: Guy Van Amringe, 55 Liberty Street, New York
Secretary: The Rev. Charles C. Edmunds, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York
Treasurer: Haley Fiske, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year — Twenty Cents a Copy
Canadian subscription, $2.25 a Year — Foreign subscription, $2.50 a Year

Volume VI — September, 1919 — Number 1

Dr. Gore on the Proposals

BEFORE the Proposals toward Unity were given to the outside world, one of the signers claimed that the Bishop of Oxford had been asked to look them over when he was in America and that he had expressed some sort of approval of them. Dr. Charles Gore is one of the highest authorities on all questions relating to the Church and the Ministry,

and therefore his opinion ought to carry weight. We are glad therefore to be able to quote his opinion of the Proposals as expressed in a letter to one of our Bishops:

"I am afraid I cannot agree to the proposals of the committee of Churchmen and Congregationalists, nor to the proposed canon.

"I do not think it would be possible, e. g. to ordain certain Congregational ministers, leaving them in the condition of being still permanent ministers of the Congregational Church, and in that capacity joined indiscriminately with others who are not episcopally ordained.

"Again, I do not think that in the celebration of the Holy Communion it is sufficient to require that they should 'include in the service the words and acts of our Lord in the institution of the sacrament.' This record of the words and acts might be read simply as a narrative,—a reading of a portion of the Gospel, — whereas in the Church the Eucharistic prayer, the canon, has always been a prayer addressed to God, and this seems to be of the essence of the Eucharistic prayer. And I think I am right in saying that the equivalent of the Epistle and Gospel has always been an invariable part of the service of Holy Communion, and also the *Sursum Corda* and the *Ter Sanctus*, and the reverent consumption of the remains of what has been consecrated.

"Thus I think that more would have to be asked for as regards the form of service used. But even if this were granted there would still remain the objection that the man whom we ordained would be still indiscriminately mixed up in his ministry in another communion with those not so ordained. I am afraid that this seems to me an impossible position."

Annulling the Compact

COMPROMISE, it has been said, is of the essence of the Anglican system and only by the tacit agreement of all concerned to exercise a mutual toleration could the divergent elements in the Post-Reformation Church ever have combined and only by the exercise of the same spirit will it be possible for them to remain permanently in the same fold.

The Prayer Book is pointed to as embodying the historic evidence of such a compromise in accordance with which the various parties were enabled to interpret its language to suit their respective views, at least so far as to afford them a reasonable standing ground. Should the balance ever be upset and any one of the schools assert its dominance and proceed to act upon that assumption to the discrediting of its rivals there would certainly be an end of the truce and the time would be ripe for a schism in the communion.

Since the "Elizabethan Settlement," so called, this spirit of compromise has availed to curb any disruptive tendencies. For the most part the Church's life has gone on if not without friction at least without developing any substantial breach in the body. "High," "Low" and "Broad" have hitherto consented to tolerate each other, while contending zealously for the principles they respectively advocated. All alike have assumed to claim for themselves a recognized place in the Church's system and have defended that claim by an appeal to the standards of the Prayer Book. It is true that the language of the Prayer Book has sometimes been strained, not to say actually wrested from its natural meaning in order to afford support for the extremists of all parties, but such a proceeding was generally felt to be unfair and received little countenance in responsible quarters.

Efforts have been made repeatedly to revise the Book in the direct interests of one or the other of the parties, but such attempts have hitherto failed and it stands today substantially the same as it always has. Happily there has always been in the Church a central group made up of men of good will from all the parties who have opposed any radical changes for fear that a successful effort to alter the accepted formularies would be sure to result in precipitating a schism. In whatever direction the personal sympathies of the members of this group might lie there was a conviction that it was better patiently to endure the difference which existed than to suffer the calamity of a break in unity.

Now as long as all parties were agreed to accept the existing situation there was, if not exactly a state of peace, at least a prolonged truce. Controversy, sometimes of a bitter nature, continued, but it was kept within limits; for it was felt that however radical the divergence there was a definite concordat to which all were solemnly pledged. Churchmen might differ among themselves as to the significance of the Sacraments or the grace of Orders but all were content to use the services of the same Prayer Book. The character of the Ministry might be differently defined but whatever the theory held to the facts were unaffected. The practical functions of the Episcopate and the Priesthood remained and were exercised however men variously might esteem these offices. The Creed was required to be said by all, however some might speciously endeavor to explain away some of the Articles.

There was one subject indeed upon which the Prayer Book made no pronouncement but which seemed on the other hand to have been discreetly avoided, namely, that of ceremonial and vestments; and accordingly it was around

this subject that controversy mainly raged for years and has only at length apparently subsided. The outcome is that what is popularly known as "Ritualism" is today a dead issue and serves no longer as a decisive factor. People employ it or dispense with it as they please. No one wishes to force it upon the unwilling nor on the other hand to prohibit its full use to those who are partial to it.

Presumably the only danger of a schism in the Church today lies in the possibility that one of the parties may renounce the compact and force legislation which will alter either the doctrine or practice of the Church in fundamental ways. Catholic Churchmen will not be likely to do this, for while there are many things in the Prayer Book which they would be glad to see changed or perhaps more definitely stated, they are satisfied upon the whole that the Book teaches the verities of the faith in a sufficient manner and stands like a rock as a witness for the ancient Apostolic Order. The Evangelical party, if such a party still exists, is not likely to become a disturbing element. Its numbers are so few that it is condemned simply to survive as an "old guard" and in any event it lacks the initiative and vitality to force an issue.

But there is a party in the Church, eager, aggressive, uncompromising, confidently believing in its own future, which seems likely—unless all signs fail—to attempt to press its convictions and plans to their logical conclusion. To do full justice to this party there is nothing secretive about it. It does not in the least resemble a band of conspirators. It fights in the open and with the visor up. Its adherents are among the cleverest men in the Church. Its exponents and supporters, — bishops, clergy and laity, — occupy some of the strongest and most strategic positions. It commands great wealth and able scholarship. Above all

it knows what it wants and judging from recent happenings seems disposed to use its advantages to the utmost with small regard for the spirit of charity or moderation.

For some time past this party has been exhibiting symptoms of a disregard for important Church principles as illustrated by certain notorious instances occurring directly under Episcopal initiative and sanction. The specific reference is to the cases where Protestant ministers have been admitted to receive the Sacrament at the Church's altars and permitted to preach sermons from the Church's pulpits.

Catholic Churchmen cannot sit down unconcernedly while such dangers threaten. Already there are signs of revolt and significant reminders from eminent quarters that such measures cannot get themselves officially sanctioned without terminating the ecclesiastical activities of some of the most devoted sons of the Church. If the ground is cut away under their feet and their witness nullified, who can blame them if they sorrowfully eliminate themselves from the ranks of leadership? There is no threat of transferring allegiance elsewhere. There is indeed to be discerned today little if any tendency Romewards. It is felt that the peace which is offered in that quarter is delusive and that laxity among ourselves constitutes no valid argument for swallowing the papal camel. Whatever happens it is safe to say that there will be no considerable exodus across the Tiber.

If such actions and proposals are not authoritatively repudiated there will be many faithful men who will have all the heart taken out of them, who will feel their usefulness in the Church is ended in that their public teaching will have been discredited and their confidence betrayed. But it is well nigh unthinkable that the age-long truce should now be broken and that measures should be forced upon the

Church which are bound to cause intense bitterness if not an actual schism in the body. Perhaps such fears are groundless and better counsels will prevail. The wisdom and conservatism of the General Convention will surely not be invoked in vain. We believe the public opinion of the Church at large will arouse itself to protest in no uncertain terms when once the issue is thoroughly understood.

Trials of the Summer Worshiper

ON a certain Sunday in July we were marooned at a well-known summer hotel in New York State. There was no church of any kind within walking distance, and we were not permitted to leave the hotel by motor on Sunday. The question was a serious one as to how we were to fulfil our Christian obligation of being present at the Lord's services on the Lord's Day.

We learned from the bulletin board Saturday evening that Catholic services would be held in the Servants' Recreation Room at 6.30 A. M. Being Catholic, we arose at an early hour and wended our way through long passages to the room indicated, where we found an improvised altar, on which were a crucifix and two lighted candles. About forty men and women in the employ of the hotel had assembled for the Mass, and several were going in turn to the priest behind a piano to make their confessions. One could almost hear his counsel and the penances he assigned. Then the priest began the Mass, one of the men from the congregation advancing to serve him. It was almost impossible to distinguish any of the Latin words uttered by the priest, as he mumbled them very rapidly. After the Creed he preached a very simple sermon of about five min-

utes on the Gospel for the day. Through the greater part of the Mass the members of the congregation paid almost no attention to what the priest said or did, but were engaged in saying their beads. However, they were very reverent and seemed to be distinctly conscious of the Divine presence. One was forcibly reminded of the early Christians worshiping in the Catacombs at break of day.

At eleven o'clock we attended the Protestant services in the main assembly room of the hotel. They were conducted by the president of an eastern university, who resides at the hotel through the summer. After the customary hymns, responsive readings, Bible lessons, and long prayer, we listened to a learned discourse on Social Reconstruction, read from manuscript. We have since discovered this discourse printed as an article (by the same university president) in the July number of the *Biblical World*. It was very evident that the sermon was the main business of the gathering, and that the note of worship was almost wholly absent. Whether the people went away spiritually enlightened or morally stimulated by the sermon, we would not presume to say.

We must confess, however, that we longed for a kind of Christian worship very different from either kind that we had taken part in that morning. Why can we not in the twentieth century find more opportunities to worship God as our Lord has commanded, through the Eucharistic worship which He instituted, in a language understood by the people, with a sermon,—instructive and inspiring if possible, but at least remotely bearing on the Christian religion?

On Taking the Whole Thing

By Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D.

WALKING up the avenue the other morning I came across Broadhurst just coming out of St. Patrick's. As we approached each other it struck me that there was something odd about him, and after a moment I made out that it was the absence of clericals. It passed through my mind that this was strange, for I recalled Broadhurst in the seminary and for the few years after during which we had been neighbors, as the most particular of all conservative Churchmen. He used to be as set on the clerical collar as the outward and visible sign of holy orders as a layman, I thought. I wondered what had happened.

But there was no time to wonder long. Broadhurst came up and we shook hands.

"Been flirting with the Scarlet Lady," I suggested.

"Rather more than a flirtation," Broadhurst returned; "it is love's young dream. You see I have gone over. I am a real Catholic now."

"That is interesting," I said, mastering my surprise. "As I remember you in the time when we used to sit up all night talking theology and planning crusades to reform the Church, you were rather inclined to the other side."

"No doubt," Broadhurst admitted; "but one moves, and when you begin to move theologically it is difficult to stop short of the throne of Peter. You know I got terribly bored by all that Protestant Episcopal muddle. I made up my mind last week to get out of it. Now I have found peace—you cannot imagine what peace unless you try it. Why not come over? You were always more inclined Romeward than I?"

"No," I answered, "I was never inclined Romeward. You thought so then and you think so now, because both then and now you confound the Catholic religion with the Papal version of it. I see no more reason for going now than I did in the seminary days—less indeed. What particular revelation of truth has made you forego your Protestant prejudices and find the Roman system so desirable?"

"Why, as I say," Broadhurst replied, "I got tired of the uncertainty of Anglicanism. You never know just where you are, or rather you never know just where the other fellow is. You lack certainty, guidance. I haven't seen you for some years now. Well, during the last three years I have been changing a good deal — got more and more 'high church,' as my senior warden put it. There got to be a good deal of grumbling in the vestry. Finally I got tired of it all. I decided that I might as well take the whole thing."

As I went on up the avenue I pondered Broadhurst's description of his mental state. He had found peace. They all say that, I thought; I fancy they must be told to say it. The peaceful state of the new convert to Rome always reminds me of the Christian Science smile—it is a little too perfect to be convincing. And I thought of the story about Fr. Benson. Going somewhere on a train he was accosted by a man in Salvation Army uniform who said, "My friend, have you found peace?" The Father, looking up from his Breviary, said, "No, I have found war," and returned to the saying of his Office.

On the whole, that would seem the ideal attitude of the member of the Church Militant. Why should one expect to find peace in the Church or anywhere else under the conditions of life today? Above all, in a world so intellectually distracted, why should one expect to find intel-

lectual peace? Broadhurst is a priest. He can nowhere find any cessation of his warfare with the world. He is a thinking human being, and he can nowhere escape the stress and strain of intellectual effort—the work of meeting and estimating the religious meaning and value of the theories which are constantly thrown off from the superheated brain of humanity. I began to get a little heated myself at the thought of the futility of attempting to solve all questions by the method of declining to consider them all and contenting one's self with repeating what one is told to say. Even supposing, I argued, that that were satisfactory to me in my private capacity, in my public capacity as a teacher I must meet the questions of other men. That I am at peace and do not want to be disturbed by them will hardly help the religious difficulties of those whom I am supposed to guide. Interior peace, peace with God—yes; one cannot very well get on without that; but exterior peace, peace with the materialistic world about one, or peace with the world of anti-Christian speculation—that cannot be. No: I will have nothing to do with peace. I am with Fr. Benson—I have found war. War is essential, not till Catholic authority silences all opposition, but till the Catholic intellect answers all questions. And we seem to be in for a long campaign, I thought, recovering my calm.

I recalled an interview with a lady not of my parish who came to consult me about some intellectual troubles. I asked her what her rector had said, and she replied: "O, I should not think of raising such questions with my rector. He's a lovely fellow, and very kind; but I know that he would be terribly disturbed by questions of this sort." Perhaps the rector would be better off, I mused, if he were to "take the whole thing."

That, by the way, is a phrase to ponder over a little. Broadhurst thought he "might as well take the whole thing." Is it then true that the Church in which Broadhurst and I were made Priests is only part of something; and if so, part of what?

I turned into the park and sat down on a bench under the shade of a wide-spreading maple and tried to think out what Broadhurst's phrase could mean. It seemed to shape itself into a definite meaning as I thought about it, but it was not the serious meaning that would justify the change of one's religion. And gradually I came to see that the reason that people assigned for the change of their religion are rarely the final and essential reasons. Men like Broadhurst leave the Church more because the state of the Church some day "gets on their nerves" than because of intellectual difficulties with the theoretical position of the Church. "The theory of Anglicanism is all right," they are apt to say, "but in fact nobody believes it." And when they are upset about something or other—the action of a Convention, the utterances of a Bishop, the opposition of a Vestry to Catholic teaching, the strain becomes too heavy and they go—"taking the whole thing" in a sense other than Broadhurst meant; accepting the whole Papal position "on faith," as one of them once said to me, and without any sort of critical examination.

But in the sense in which Broadhurst was using the phrase there lay hid a certain popular theory of the religion of the American Church—the same view that very ignorant people give voice to when they say: "But you're just like the Catholics." The underlying thought would seem to be this. One goes into certain parishes of the American Church and finds there a conception of religion presented in definite, dogmatic teaching which gives the im-

pression that the teacher is standing on quite firm intellectual ground, and that he is conscious of not teaching some merely personal opinion that he has acquired but is proclaiming truth which he feels to be quite definitely settled. This dogmatic teaching is presented not only from the pulpit and in catechisms and instructions, but it is applied to the souls of individuals through a round of sacramental action. Those who are earnest about their spiritual lives and seeking cleansing and strength through the application of our Lord's humanity to their souls through appointed means are carrying the teaching into action. And further, this teaching and the sacramental action, are constantly illustrated and emphasized by an elaborate round of ceremonial which suffuses into them a mystic warmth. Now a very common assumption is that all this round of teaching, of sacramental life, of ceremonial, is quite foreign to the normal practice of the Christian religion as this Church has received the same. That, essentially, is not an Anglican thing at all, but is a quite conscious borrowing from a foreign system that the Anglican Church has repudiated, and that as borrowed it is a thing of shreds and patches, and that the system from which it is borrowed is the whole thing. Why, then, not "take the whole thing?" We may be sure that this view is immensely stressed by the Roman propagandists.

This view of things receives some support from the existence in our communion of a certain number of persons, Priests and Laity, who are quite conscious borrowers. They take things Roman because they are Roman, so far as one can see. They are at small pains to know the history of the Church—one of the distinguishing marks of the type is a dislike of history—they have no notion as to what is Anglican and what is not; or of how our heritage was largely

lost to us for a couple of centuries. They have little sense of the real differences betwen the Anglican Church and Rome. They treat Rome as justified in proportion as it approximates to the standard. They are largely sentimental persons, devoted to a type of service which has sentimental rather than devotional appeal. They constantly quote Rome as authority for their beliefs and practices. They are constantly telling you that the American Church has "no authority;" and when you point out to them that while it may not have very much "authority" in their sense, it has far more than they have ever dreamed of obeying, they say , "O, well, how can you?" What they really mean is that the American Church lacks discipline—which for them is fortunate, for if it had adequate discipline they would be the first to suffer from its application.

Sitting on a bench in the park, with a group of small children joyously feeding squirrels in the foreground, the question finally presented itself to me in this way. What one has to make up one's mind about as an Anglican, is not whether our religion is a patch-work of indiscriminate borrowings—no sane student would maintain that though some slight color is given to the assertion by the action of sporadic clergy, but whether the religion of the American Church as we have learned it is an adequate expression of the Gospel of Christ, as adequate an expression of it as that found in the Oriental and Latin Churches. And when I say the religion of the American Church I mean not what this or that man teaches, but I mean that religion as it is expressed in the formal documents of the Church interpreted in the light of its history. If the religion of the American Church is an adequate expression of the life and action of the Gospel then it is a *whole thing* and we are

quite right to stand by it even though the standing by means that we find not peace but war.

We might put it in this way: Is the Anglican Church capable of producing a complete religious experience?

If I understand the Christian religion at all the purpose of our Lord's life and work was to unite us, through His incarnate nature, with God the Blessed Trinity. When by the extension of His incarnate life He created the Church to be His mystical Body, He endowed it with all the means that were necessary to produce and to support the life of union with Him which we live here on earth, and to fit us for the fuller realization of that gift of life in the world to come. How this life is imparted, how the soul is led to Christ and re-created in Him, how its sins are forgiven and the possibility of pure living given to it,—how, in short, the Holy Spirit, the Vicar of Christ, builds up the spiritual life and brings us into the heritage of God's children,—all this is written in the Gospel and was practiced by the Church before any line of the Gospel was written and has continued to be practiced in it. As we read the Gospel, as we study the life of the Church, is it true that we find commands of our Lord which are disregarded, that we find principles of the spiritual life which are arbitrarily set aside, that we find aids to the spiritual growth of the Christian which are discarded, in that expression of faith and life which is embodied in the Book of Common Prayer and in the other formularies of the Anglican Communion? If it be so, I do not know what they are.

It is no doubt true that there are details in the manner of expression and of application of the Prayer Book system which one could criticise. The failure to provide for the administration of the Sacrament of Unction is probably the most serious omission. But criticism of that sort may

be passed on every religious body in existence. The theologians of the Latin Church will not undertake to defend all features of its practice, and there is no reason why we who do not belong to the Roman obedience should regard spiritual experience as standardized by the Latin Church, leaving us with only the obligation of conformity. A true and deep spiritual experience is produced in the churches of the Anglican Communion; and there is no reason for thinking it produced by the Spirit breathing where it listeth and making good the deficiencies of a mistaken system, but it is as obviously produced through the media of the system itself as it is in the Latin or Oriental Churches. The life that is produced is the sacramental life of incorporation in Christ. It is generated by the application of the life of Christ to the soul of the believer through the means which He Himself ordained to that end.

I find myself wondering how Broadhurst possibly could have missed this. He had always had some sacramental grasp of religion—had believed in the "sacraments of the Gospel" if in no more. I gathered from what he said that he had gone on to the Catholic position of the formularies of the Church. How had he missed the fact that the validity of the sacraments of the Church is guaranteed in experience? Had he not had experience enough in dealing with individual souls to get at the true sources of their spiritual life?

There is one difficulty of our Church life, I recognize. Where the practice of Confession is not wide spread, the American dread of speaking of spiritual things leaves the lives of his people, with rare exceptions, a closed book to a Priest. It is a pathetic thing to watch the American Christian working hard to avoid the suspicion that he ever has a spiritual thought. But Broadhurst should have known

all this; he should have known that the man who tried to hold him off with a joke when he wanted to talk of the things of the spirit was just afflicted with the Anglican disease of false shame which makes it difficult to say prayers when anybody is about, and an impossible thing to speak of his spiritual experience.

But how is it that Broadhurst and his like do not know the reality of the sacraments in their own experience? They have stood at the altar for years. It seems incredible that this should mean nothing to them. They have themselves practised Confession; have they no experience of the relief of Absolution? Have they never so exercised their Orders as to know that they are valid?

"But," I can imagine Broadhurst saying as I have heard others say: "But the uncertainty, the lack of uniformity, the go-as-you-please of the American Church! The lack of any sort of authority in the parish Priest who has to gain his influence, not by his position and authority as a Priest, but by 'jollying' people; by being a 'mixer' and a good-fellow generally — by anything but the power of his priestly office. How about the people who withdraw their subscriptions if you teach what the Prayer Book tells you to teach; who take their departure if you stress the Catholic faith; who openly insult you if they do not like what you wear or where you stand; what about all that?"

Well, on the whole, I should say that that belonged to a state of war; was one of the expected phenomena of the Church Militant. All the foes of the Church with whom we have to contend are not unbaptized heathen, they are more often of our own household. They are not bad people, but ignorant and ill-instructed people, who object not unnaturally to having their inherited Protestantism overturned. It would appear to be a part of our work, not a

very pleasant part to be sure, to deal with them as best we may. If the end in any parish is that we are worsted, well and good; let us take our way elsewhere. The one thing that would seem to be illegitimate under the circumstances would be to go off in pursuit of peace. I should think it was a case for prayer and meditation and the cultivation of the fruits of the Spirit.

For—and this seems to have escaped the minds of disgruntled Anglicans in search of peace (which usually means the peace of getting one's own way)—no amount of disorder and ill discipline in the Church proves anything at all about the Roman Church. Let all that is alleged about the American Church be admitted, short of the assertion that it has denied the Faith,—and how does that prove that the Papal Infallibility was decreed by our Lord in St. Peter and has been accepted by the whole Catholic Church ever since? How does it prove that the substitution of the rule of the Papacy for the rule of Bishops is not an overthrow of the early Constitution of the Church? Prove the Anglican Church as lax as you will, how does that prove that the Papal Church is "the whole thing?"

The children and the squirrels had gone, and I felt I might as well follow. The case seemed to have been thought out. I could only wish that Broadhurst would find his peace undisturbed. For myself, the future could hold only war.

Psychological Barriers to Reunion

By Rev. Hamilton Schuyler.

PERHAPS the barriers to what is euphemistically termed the "reunion of Christendom" are not so much those which lie directly upon the surface as those which lie far deeper and operate unconsciously to block the way of approach to a mutual understanding as between those who find themselves at variance in religious matters. Even if an agreement could be reached as to the obvious differences which serve to divide Christian people there would still remain between them a great gulf fixed due to the dissimilarity of the *ethos* which distinguishes them.

Between Churchmen and members of the Protestant bodies for example there exists a certain indefinable uncongeniality of temper, a subtle dissidence of spirit, all the stronger because they are instinctive and sub-conscious. They tend far more effectually to prevent an agreement than does any formal divergence in faith and order, however radical. Churchmen and Protestants, often with the best will in the world, fail to understand each other's point of view, and this because they do not comprehend each other's language, even when using the same religious terminology. They do not mean the same things when they employ theological formulæ verbally identical. Their emphasis and sense of values are never the same. Differences in doctrine, forms of worship, and ecclesiastical polity, though they are serious factors to be reckoned with in any scheme looking to organic unity, are plainly therefore not the chief barriers to be overcome.

Between ourselves and the various bodies which for the sake of convenience may be termed Protestant, there would

seem in these days to be a diminishing margin of disagreement in many of the elements which ostensibly serve to divide us. The Nicene Creed is conceded by all to represent a sufficient statement of the Christian faith. There are probably few in any of the bodies who today would continue to stand apart solely on account of liturgical and ritual forms; and even in the matter of polity it seems likely that the Episcopate as a historic institution apart from any prelatical or sacerdotal implications will not permanently continue to serve as a divisive element. The Bible of course, is regarded by all as "the inspired word of God," though that phrase would be variously interpreted. Baptism and the Lord's Supper as scriptural rites are already observed by all, though the traditional doctrines underlying these sacraments would hardly receive universal assent. In other words, the Quadrilateral with its logical corollaries might be accepted in good faith and yet nevertheless Churchmen and Protestants would still be no nearer to a solid basis of unity than they are today.

It is evident that unity in religion may exist with a certain diversity in doctrine and practice. Such a unity prevailed among all Christians east and west up to the time of the Great Schism. But this unity in diversity coincided with a genuine *esprit de corps* and was cemented by the possession of a common Catholic sentiment. Christians of pre-Reformation days might differ widely in many ways but there was a solidarity as of the members of one family brought up in the same home and trained along the same general lines, though differing personally in natural gifts, modes of expression and temperament. Language, rites, and ceremonies might vary but there was a common Catholic consciousness which all possessed and whereby they knew themselves to belong to the same household of faith.

On the other hand, between members of the various Catholic groups and Protestants generally, however closely the two may otherwise be allied in race, political institutions, social customs, and language, this common consciousness is conspicuously lacking. Thus the two are less spiritually akin to each other than are the several Catholic groups which have otherwise little or no interest in common save their religion.

An illustration of this fact is suggested by an episode in the writer's own personal experience. Several years ago when he was travelling in Egypt many hundred miles up the Nile he found himself in a native village where he attended a midnight mass of the Coptic Christians which was celebrated in a wretched adobe building. The occasion was the Coptic Christmas Eve. There were less than two score persons present and the surroundings and the accessories were of the most primitive character. Though of course he could not understand the language used and the details of ritual and ceremonial were strange to him, he was surprised to find himself entering heartily into the spirit of the service and feeling quite at home in the strange assembly. Though the singing was far from being musical according to the occidental ear, and the officiating priest and his attendants wore their turbans and the usual oriental garb, there was something that seemed wonderfully familiar in the atmosphere and proceedings. Instinctively it was borne in upon his consciousness that he was assisting at a Eucharistic service of the Catholic Church as it had come down from remote antiquity. The family likeness was unmistakable even among much that was incongruous. As between the assembly of these humble oriental Christians and one made up of the educated Protestant people of his own race and country he felt he had infinitely

more in common ecclesiastically with the former than with the latter; so true to their respective types under all circumstances are the two systems and so mutually antipathetic are their characters and manifestations.

As with the atmosphere of worship so also with the doctrinal statements as set forth in the Creed. The Catholic and the Protestant ideals are not on the same plane. Take almost any article of the Creed and work it out in its various implications and the result will show a wide divergence in thought and apprehension between the two. For example, when a Churchman uses the words "the holy Catholic Church" he has a certain definite conception of their significance. In his mind there is a concrete entity answering to the phrase. He views the Church as a historic body visibly energizing in the world and organically connected with the original Christian society by the unbroken links of an apostolic ministry. This conception unconsciously colors all his religious thinking and moulds his spiritual and devotional life. When a Protestant uses the same phrase he commonly understands something entirely different. He envisages not a definite body corporate, but rather an inchoate invisible company composed of those who secretly answer a certain religious test and who thus are known solely to Almighty God as comprising the true Church.

The Protestant mind seems incapable of understanding what a Churchman means when he speaks of the Church. It is not that he does not want to comprehend the Churchman's point of view, but rather that he is temperamentally unable to do so. The root ideas of both are different and not to be reconciled the one with the other. When the Churchman says "the Church teaches this" or, "the Church stands for that," he usually knows definitely what he

means. The Protestant may give his assent to the phrase but he does not attach the same values to it.

In the matter of divine worship there is an equal dissimilarity between the two as revealed, respectively, in the very character of their buildings and the accessories employed. To the Catholic, worship is the rendering to God in objective forms of corporate praise and thanksgiving on the part of the faithful. God and His glory, not man and his needs, are central in his thoughts. There is a mystical element present that tends to make him forget self and desire to merge his personality in the larger unity of the whole body. Worship to him is giving something not getting something. Worship is the function of the Church considered as an integer and not a mere act of individuals, however piously disposed. On the other hand, according to the popular Protestant conception, divine worship represents primarily an occasion for self-edification, for personal inspiration and ethical enlightenment. The sermon or discourse is the chief thing and furnishes the *rationale* for the assembly. The two conceptions are as wide apart as the poles and find their issue and reflection in two different types of the religious life. Which of the twain is the better type, more consonant with the Christian ideal, it is not perhaps necessary at this time to enquire. The fact remains, however, that the two are mutually antipathetic and cannot be harmonized under one system.

Again when Churchmen speak of the "Sacramental System" they speak of something which finds little sympathetic response in the Protestant mind. In discussing this subject with Protestant divines the writer has been repeatedly struck with the difficulty of conveying to them any idea of the important part which the Sacramental system occupies in the conception and practice of the Episcopal Church.

He seemed to be speaking in an unknown tongue and was unable to see that he had made the slightest impression upon their minds. The inference is that the plane of ideas was so different that the task of elucidation was well nigh impossible.

Even in the realm of morality or ethics Churchmen and Protestants move in different orbits. Much that seems wrong and unchristian to one is not necessarily so to the other. By inheritance most Protestants are imbued with the Puritanical temperament, in accordance with which they are prone to condemn as sinful many actions which to Churchmen are indifferent or harmless. The Puritan was opposed on principle to any indulgence in what he deemed "worldly pleasures." His outlook on life was sombre. He had no patience with natural gaiety and the sports and amusements of the common people. Macaulay, in classic language, has fitly portrayed him with all his unlovely traits, as also in his strength and sterling qualities. If the Puritan was not an altogether new type in Christendom, he at least accentuated the spirit and temperament of a character that was always in marked contrast to the normal Catholic development.

It would be untrue to say that modern Protestants invariably reproduce the acrid Puritan temper, but clear evidence of their spiritual ancestry is seldom lacking when the occasion arises. "Scratch a Russian and you will find a Tartar" is an old proverb. "Scratch a Protestant and you will find a Puritan" might equally serve to describe the reaction which takes place in response to appropriate stimuli. This survival of the Puritan temper in the Protestant consciousness tends to a radical misconception of the Catholic attitude towards many social questions. Prohibition, Sunday observance, popular amusements, etc., are thus all con-

templated from different angles. The tolerance of Catholics in respect to the moderate use of intoxicating beverages; their unwillingness to condemn the practice as a sin *per se* is set down as showing indifference to a great moral issue. The principles governing the proper observance of the Lord's day, which, according to the Catholic standpoint, freely allow suitable recreation after the stated religious obligations, seem to Protestants who have been brought up in strict Sabbatarian notions as a virtual repudiation of a divine command. Protestants are prone to bar many forms of popular amusement and recreation which Churchmen regard as ethically indifferent, to be indulged in or refrained from according as the individual conscience may dictate.

In a recent discussion with a fellow priest over the prospect of unity with our Protestant brethren he declared as his deliberate conviction that the most serious obstacle to an understanding was the wide divergence which obtained on moral standards. This priest had recently been in intimate contact with ministers of the various Protestant bodies in his own community honestly endeavoring to work out a basis for a measure of local church unity. "I am convinced," he said, "that they, the Protestant ministers, tend to regard the Episcopal Church and more especially its clergy as dangerously lax if not morally perverted in respect to many matters which they esteem of fundamental importance." Whether this estimate be correct or not, there certainly does exist a radical difference in the standpoint from which the two survey important departments of human life and activity.

If it were conceivable that an agreement could be reached tomorrow whereby Churchmen and members of the various Protestant denominations could effect a formal unity it is

safe to say that such unity would prove to be merely a mechanical arrangement and would utterly fail to weld the two into a homogenous organism. In the final issue either the *ethos* of Churchmen or of Protestants would have to prevail. Otherwise the union would have to be dissolved on grounds familiar to the divorce courts, namely, "incompatibility of temper."

Incompatibility of temper may not furnish a just ground for separation after a union has once been freely effected, but it would certainly constitute the height of unwisdom to enter into such a union if the disparity were previously known to exist. Better to continue in a state of single-blessedness than to suffer the consequences of an ill-mated marriage. There are elements which can never coalesce because by an immutable law of nature they belong to a different order. Those whom God hath not joined together will do well to remain asunder unless and until He works a miracle of grace and leads them by His Spirit to be of one heart and of one mind.

For this blessed consummation let all good Christians everywhere continue earnestly to pray and work, foregoing in the meanwhile any attempt prematurely to force an issue between those who today are conscious of feeling little spiritual affinity with each other. At the utmost, men may effect an artificial union, but it is God alone who maketh them to be of one mind in an house.

Our Czecho-Slovak Neighbors

By Rev. Thomas J. Lacey, Ph.D.

A TOURIST motoring through the Czech settlement on Long Island, not far from Sayville, passes a wonderful statue of John Huss. I am told it is the only one in America. It rises from a little mound within the shadow of St. John's Chapel, and represents the reformer standing with the chalice in his right hand. The pedestal bears the inscription, "Cesky Reformator, Jan Hus."

The history of Bohemia revolves around the eucharistic cup. The religious and military movements that shook the national life to its foundations grew out of the contest for the chalice in the Holy Communion. The Czecho-Slovak soldiers fighting in far off Russia last summer with no independent national existence and no flag of their own raised the old Hussite banner bearing the symbolic chalice. The same symbol they wore on their shoulder straps.

A cable from Rome dated June 22, announces the expected arrival of a deputation of Roman Catholic clergy from Czecho-Slovakia asking the Pope to establish an independent Czech patriarchate to permit the use of the Czech tongue instead of Latin in the mass, and to grant priests the right to marry. It is reported that more than thirty thousand Czecho-Slovak women have signed a memorial in favor of the marriage of priests.

Last September our government recognized the Czecho-Slovaks as a belligerent nation. Their territory embraced Silesia, Moravia, Bohemia and Slovakia, all of which were yet under the rule of Austro-Hungary. These people had no capital and no national title, but they possessed a valiant army made up of thousands who had been impressed

against their will into the Austro-Hungarian forces, had deserted and organized as fighting units in Siberia, Russia, Italy and France. The story of this army forms one of the most romantic chapters in the history of the war, and the annals of its march through Russia and Siberia must be placed alonside of Xenophon's "Anabasis."

The allied victory became to these people a guarantee of national resurrection. Czecho-Slovakia took its place upon the map of Europe. In December Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk took the oath of office at Prague as President of the new Republic. Its flag with two broad stripes, white and red, was hoisted over the Legation in London. The Peace treaty guarantees the future of the Czecho-Slovak States.

Christianity came to the Czechs from the East. The Moravian Czechs sought Christian teachers from the Byzantine emperor in the 9th century, and in response, Cyril and Methodius came from Thessalonica. These brothers were the apostles to the Slavs. Their names are venerated today throughout Slavdom. Cyril invented the Cyrillic alphabet still in use in Russia, Serbia and Bulgaria. Thessalonica is the city to which St. Paul wrote his epistles—the earliest documents of the New Testament. It is the modern "Saloniki" which has played a large role in the Balkan wars and in the great world conflict.

The influence of these early Greek missionaries lingered on in spite of many vicissitudes of national history which brought the Czechs into bitter conflict at times with the Germans and the Pope. John Huss, the exponent of Czech nationalism in the 14th century, was imbued with the spirit of Eastern church tradition. He was a serious, scholarly, academic man. In 1402 he was rector of Prague University and preacher at Bethlehem Chapel, established by a patriotic merchant as a center of preaching in the Czech mother

tongue. Bohemia and England were dynastically allied. In 1381 Anna, the sister of King Wenceslaus, married Richard II. There was an intimate relation between the Wiclif and Hussite movements. Jerome of Prague was a student at Oxford. He copied some of Wiclif's writings and carried them to Prague. Huss copied Wiclif word for word.

John Huss enshrined the national aspirations of the Czech race. He attended the Council of Constance under promise of safe conduct from the Emperor Sigismund. He was arrested by the Papal party and cast into prison. Brought to trial he was uncompromizing, persisted in his position and was burned at stake as an heretic by order of the council on July 6, 1415. His martyrdom was an outrage on the Bohemian people whose representative voice he was. His death was the signal for the Hussite wars. His followers contended for the administration of the cup in the eucharist. This was the rallying cry. The contest went on intermittently, but by the year 1620, Bohemian independence was lost. The nation was brought completely under the Hapsburg yoke, and the church was in nominal obedience to the Pope. Verily these are days of the restitution of all things. After centuries of bondage the Czecho-Slovaks are free, and with the freedom of the state there has come a yearning for the freedom of the church. The visit of the Czecho-Slovak deputation to Rome represents the grouping after the ideals of the primitive Catholic Church. It reveals what is working in the hearts of the people.

The calamity that overwhelmed the national life of the Czecho-Slovaks three hundred years ago gave a great impulse to emigration. Large numbers left their homeland and settled in England, Holland and America. They en-

tered the stream of American immigration at an early date. Reminiscence of their settlements lingers in the names Bohemia, L. I., and Moravia, Tex. In Cedar Rapids, Iowa, recently I noted a section of the Public Library reserved for books in the Czech language. Highly intelligent and thrifty, attractive and passionately devoted to music, they enter fully and rapidly into the spirit of American life, and readily master the English language. They represent a valuable asset. In 1912 we received 8439 Czech immigrants. Only 75 of them were illiterate.

The presence of these people in our midst to the number of many thousands, indicates a promising field of activity for our Church and lays a peculiar responsibility upon American churchmen. As far back as 1855 parts of the Prayerbook were translated into the Czech language and published at St. Louis. But now these people are no longer strangers to our language and our ways. They are in the second and third generation of residence. They speak English and are part and parcel of American life. Numbers of them are already incorporated in our various parishes. The Roman Church is strongly intrenched amongst them. Protestant missionary activity is seen at its best in the John Huss Church and House on E. 74th St., Manhattan, with a Sunday School of 1200 children. The development of this work is a tribute to the character and untiring devotion of Pastor Vincent Pisek, who has labored here for over 30 years. There still remains a vast Czsch population who are untouched by any religious ministrations, and when once they see and know our church they are drawn to it by a sort of spiritual affinity, normally, naturally and irresistibly. Dr. Stires relates many incidents of successful work among Czech children in Grace Church, Chicago, under his rectorship. The Czechs are our close ecclesiastical kin, and it re-

mains for us to gather these disciples of John Huss within the fold of our Holy Catholic Church where they will find the very principles which their souls are seeking—worship in the vernacular — a married clergy and the cup in the eucharist. There are signs of awakened interest. Fifty Cezcho-Slovaks in picturesque native costume attended St. Barnabas Church, Newark, last month. At a great service held in Brooklyn, N. Y., resolutions of greeting were ordered sent to President Masaryk. The Bishop of Harrisburg transmitted them handsomely engraved. Trinity College, Hartford, at its recent commencement made President Masaryk an honorary Doctor of Laws.

These little incidents, I take it, are the happy omens of a coming fellowship between our old utraquist Church and these spiritual children of the Hussite movement in their sacramental craving for the "chalice of the grapes of God."

Peter, Therefore, Was Kept In Prison

By Rev. Maurice Picard, M.A., Ph.D.

DURING the past year the conduct and fortune of St. Peter have been made representative of the behavior and lot of the Church by the writers of several magazine articles. The series began with "Peter Sat by the Fire and Warmed Himself," in the *Atlantic Monthly* of February, 1918. At the risk of the accusation of having adopted a now obsolete form of title, the present writer has chosen "Peter, therefore, was kept in prison," as expressive of the situation in which the Church finds herself today.

The sentence is a symbol of the restraint which seems to characterize nearly all the activities of the Church. We hear persons ask, "Why does not the Church do this or do

that?" Behold some organized effort to gain a praiseworthy end. Why is not the Church in the front rank of its supporters? Those who scoff say, "Surely, if the Church today is the body which Christ founded, if it is permeated with the light of God's Holy Spirit, it ought to lead this movement. But see its impotence!" What may the Christian reply, but that, when the Church longed to press forward and to assume leadership, "St. Peter was kept in prison."

If we ask why the Church is kept in prison, a number of answers suggest themselves. A favorite way of relieving her from all responsibility is to lay the entire blame on the lack of Christian unity that prevails in the Christian world. If the Church fulfilled the petition of her Lord in His high-priestly prayer before the betrayal, "that they all may be one," what might she not do! But her lack of unity places her behind fast-barred windows, and she looks through them at a piecemeal landscape and wishes that she might tear down the bars and go forth unhampered to her rightful work.

Even if the lack of Christian unity does not wholly hamper sections of the Church from engaging in a restricted leadership, there are other facts that make her imprisonment little short of complete. What happened when the Western Church was undivided in the Middle Ages? Do we observe that she then was pioneer in all of the great forward movements of mankind? Much rather is it apparent that "Peter followed afar off." The late Andrew D. White, in his monumental work, "A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology," shows in a very painstaking manner how the Church at all times lagged behind when some new discovery was presented to the world. She was the foe of geology, of meteorology, of medicine, of sanita-

tion, of biology. Only when compelled to do so, did she effect a compromise, reinterpret her dogma to suit newly discovered facts, and change her enmity for a grudging friendship. Blame, if we will, individual prelates for their misguided obstinacy, exonerate the Holy Spirit from all part in the Church's Fabian policy, we yet must recognize that in every period save the earliest the Church has been intensely conservative. The conservatism is easily explained: Holy Church cannot afford to be wrong. It is true, of course, that dogma must be expounded in language that must reflect the opinions of the age. It is true that many of these opinions may be proved erroneous as time goes on. But even if dogmas must engage in material cooperation with error at times, the Church has not felt that she can afford to risk making new blunders. If a Darwin presents a new theory of the development of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, or if a Copernicus works a revolution in the conceptions of astronomy, the Church must needs wait until these theories have been subjected to the test of time before she is willing to espouse them to the extent of showing that her truth is not out of harmony with their findings. She must preserve the truth of religion at all cost. She must therefore be conservative and on the defensive. She is *therefore* kept in prison.

Her imprisonment prevents her from blazing new trails. In her relation to science this fact is especially conspicuous. The whole history of scientific achievement tells how the Church has always lagged behind in the recognition of new scientific truth, and pages of that history tell of great damage wrought to many noble spirits whose passion for the truth has led them to defy common opinion. Happily, however, this phase of opposition from the side of conservatism is now almost past. The foundations of most of the sci-

ences have been laid, and a reconciliation with the Church effected. The Church is now friendly to further scientific progress. Indeed, she has discovered that the domain of science cannot properly imperil that of religion.

The conflict with progress no longer prevails in the scientific field, but is carried on in the field of social problems. The Church, it is true, has not opposed new theories of society. The harm that the Church has done is by way of indifference. There seems to be no real voice of the Church on social matters. Each parish apparently speaks with the voice of the most influential members of the congregation. If the rector be a socialist, we shall find the chief emphasis of his preaching and of the parish activities which he directs laid in this field. The congregation is likely to be composed of men and women who share his interests and who either have been attracted to the parish by his preaching or have called him in the knowledge that they have common interests. Another parish, numbering in its register many of the monied group, will apparently stand for a conservative republicanism. The "bourgeois" parishes, with vestries chosen from the "middle class," will be pacific and neutral in tone. In each of these cases, we may recognize, there is no voice of the Church, but there are voices of individuals and groups within the Church. The Church herself seems to look on with indifference.

This indifference on social questions proceeds from a tradition. It is the outcome of a special interpretation of the words of Christ, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Our Church has always stood aloof from pronouncement on the good or evil of civil laws. Provided they do not violate too flagrantly common moral decency, she never protests against them. Her rule has been always to

support lawfully constituted authority. In our own country she has given civil liberty in exchange for ecclesiastical liberty. This policy, in time past, has proved most useful as a general rule, but it cannot be denied that she has also been somewhat hampered. The tradition of "hands off" has deprived her of impressiveness when she has felt it to be her duty to speak. Her influence at such times is nil. Perhaps she has separated too sharply the life of men under civil and under divine law. Thus has she been kept in prison.

One would not expect to find her imprisonment extending into the religious sphere. Christ promised that the Holy Spirit would lead her into all truth. There can be no question that spiritual truth is included in the promise. Leading implies advance, and we should expect to find new revelations of spiritual truth easily flowing from the gracious fountain within her. In the modern age, at least, this does not seem to be the case. With too little faith in the abundant supply of the source, she has kept the water as nearly level as possible, lest a sudden spurt take away water from another part. Thus she discouraged John Wesley's society. Another example is the case of the Emmanuel movement. The revival of the ministry of healing within the Church, at least in any pretentious degree, was brought about by the sight of numerous faith-healing sects sprung up without the pale. Peter followed afar off. The Church was not a pioneer; she was kept in prison until the movement started from without.

And yet we must never forget that the ideal of the Church is an ideal of freedom. She is *kept* in prison, kept there against her will. There is no reason why she should not regain her freedom. The chief cause of her retention is the presence of an ever watchful Herod. This Herod is

an inordinate fear of the error which accompanies the reasoning of men and lack of confidence in the power of the Spirit to triumph over this error. In the early days of her history, the Church learned a lesson. She discovered that perversions of the truth are quick to appear when the truth is not safeguarded. She became defensive when she formulated the creeds. We must distinguish between two separate effects of the process of credal formulation. The first was unification and clarification of doctrine, and this effect was produced by the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The second effect was psychological and quite human: the conflict with heresy which was the immediate cause of the formulation of creeds left a temper of mind that would have been avoided, had the unification proceeded without the conflict. The necessity of a continuous warfare against heresy put the Church on the defensive. In her earliest days, apostles, evangelists, and teachers gave free expression to the divinely inspired thoughts that came to them. They were not over-cautious. Later, a consciousness of having to defend all their statements quenched some of the divine fire. Thus a temper of mind in individuals within the Church kept and now keeps the corporate Church from freedom in transmitting to mankind messages of the Spirit.

Must the Church remain in prison? Is it not possible that she may return in some degree to the freedom of Pentecost, and speak in many languages to many minds? If we may not expect immediate freedom, we may at least indicate four conditions of the attainment of that freedom.

First, our Church will never be free until she gains consciousness of her true nature. As long as it is possible to hear diametrically opposite teaching from pulpits of the same Church upon matters of the most essential importance to the faith, so long will that Church not be free. It is a

hopeful sign of the times that Churchmen of all parties are beginning to recognize this fact. There is a widespread restlessness among the clergy and laity. It is becoming felt more and more that the policy of silence and toleration is inadequate and unjust rather than eirenic and charitable. No longer should we feel disturbed because those who differ in viewpoint are organizing and drawing up a platform. Differences will not be composed by burying them; they must be aired with precision, if opportunity is given for misunderstandings to be removed. It is devoutly to be hoped that the House of Bishops will soon make some pronouncement concerning disputed matters of faith and order.

Secondly, our Church will not be free until she puts forth a constructive social program which will be authoritative to the extent of giving the mind of the whole Church on matters of vital import to civilization. Groups of political agitators are seeking to undermine personal and political liberty. The situation is entirely different from what it was a year ago. The Church can play an important part in restraining insurgent forces; it must do so, if it is to be free and command the respect of the nation.

Thirdly, our Church can obtain her release from prison only when her individual communicants tear aside the mask of conventionality and respectability in which her face is shrouded. There is something radical about freedom. That kind of radicalism which revels in disorder is not desired, but a radicalism which is characterized by sincerity and honesty. We need fewer parishes that are social clubs, and more parishes that do a truly religious work. Every member of the Body of Christ can help the Church gain her freedom by placing the correct emphasis through all her work.

Fourthly, our Church will not be free until her members remember and act on the words that follow the clause, "Peter, therefore, was kept in prison,"—which are, "but prayer was made without ceasing of the Church for him." We may not believe that the Holy Spirit will ever desert His own. But there are crises in the life of the Church which draw nearer every day. It is meet, therefore, that every son of the Church put on the armor of prayer and go forth to help in the releasing of his mother from prison.

Prayer Book Revision and the Mission Church

By Rev. Marshall M. Day, B.D.

IT is hardly a cause for wonder that the stirring times in which we live should make men forget that there ever was such a question as Prayer Book Revision. We have been, and still are, living and feeling great things, and in the stress of this larger thought and feeling we are not so concerned as we have been about the manner of its expression. Somehow, we feel, any life as intense as that we now live will find its own expression without conscious effort; the stream of new spiritual life is so strong and full that it will make its own course. The figure itself supplies our answer, for in a developed and mature country streams cannot be left to choose their own course, lest they destroy the accumulated fruit of laborious centuries of patient building. Moreover, streams wandering at random do no work comparable to the power developed by the same waters when, by the imposition of strict checks and limits, by dykes and dams, their force is concentrated and applied. The subject, then, of Prayer Book Revision is neither jejune

nor untimely; though in its discussion we could well afford a new and different emphasis.

For there is a real misfortune in delivering up the problems of Prayer Book Revision entirely to the liturgical expert and the doctrinaire. Not that the two are to be considered synonymous. The former is to be found nobly represented in the personnel of the Commission on Revision; the latter, writing passionate letters to the Church press, to tell us what some divine, whom nobody ever heard of, said to some Bishop, who is to most of us just a name, about the emplacement of a semicolon as an outpost of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. But both types of mind are marked by a tendency to put intellectual considerations before the experienced facts of human nature. Both are peculiarly liable to Bacon's "errors of the den." So one cannot but feel that certain factors which constantly enter into the discussion are completely beside the point, certain others false to the spiritual atmosphere of the problem of our religious self-expression. Let the parish priests, who are perhaps too busy dealing with living souls to become "experts" in anything, speak also, for they have not merely to think about these problems, but to live with and by the result of the answers.

What is it that we in the active field have to do? We must attract people to the Church, keep them there, deepen and strengthen their spiritual lives, and provide for them the best possible expression of the love and aspiration of their souls. The purpose of the revision is nothing else but to re-present the devotion of age-long tradition in such a way as to enable us to do these things for the men of today. We are immediately face to face with two conditions which greatly complicate the problem of reform: the lack of unanimity of aims and ideals among our own clergy and

people; and a very real misunderstanding and want of sympathy with us, on the part of those who are not members of our fold. These conditions are found everywhere, and even in the larger communities and well-established parishes they are a real hindrance to growth in grace or numbers; but it is in the Mission Church that the problem is felt most poignantly, and the need for a solution is most pressing.

The diversity of religious customs and aims among our own people is felt with especial keenness in the small mission, struggling to establish itself firmly in a new community. It has no central group, perhaps the descendants of several generations of parishioners, trained in the parish, creating by long association a body of parochial tradition not lightly altered, and serving as a norm by which to judge the divergence of particular groups and individuals. In a larger congregation such persons form a center around which any number of religious and spiritual varieties may be firmly and securely grouped. But practically every family of Churchmen in the mission has come from a different parish; where its members probably formed part of the central body of normal parishioners, and grew up in the belief that their particular type of worshipful expression was the real norm of the Church's use. Rare indeed is the communicant who is content to follow loyally the Parson's leading, trusting to his special training and sworn obedience to keep the mission faithful to the Church's essential law. Instead there is the sometimes patient and tearful, more often angry and resentful, complaint that "it doesn't seem to be the same Church at all"; because something that Father A—— or Mr. B—— did, or failed to do, is treated differently by the Priest who is now, at least in theory, the guide and shepherd of their souls. This tendency of the parishioners of a mission church to expect everything to be

done exactly in the manner of their former parish reaches its highest development if the mission contains many families of the English working-class, who will tolerate not the smallest deviation from the usage of their own particular corner of the Church of England. I know of one distracted missionary who is always in trouble. He is expected to conform, not only his liturgical observances but also all social activities and the system of parochial finance, to the rigid Anglicanism of the Tewkesbury Abbey, the strict Georgian conservatism of an ultra-Evangelical rural parish in Kent, and S. Alban's, Holborn. In a large parish the body of settled and traditional parishioners would, by the laws of group-psychology, largely restrain these divergences. In the new and small mission, where the absence of each single individual leaves, not a tear, but a great staring rent in the robe of the Bride, there is no solvent but the Priest's own statesmanship to melt and fuse these different traditions.

The obvious deduction from all this is that there are disadvantages to "our glorious comprehensiveness"; but how does that affect practically the problems of Prayer Book Revision? I think that will not be difficult to show. From many quarters, especially from the rectors of large city parishes, men whose contact with the rank and file of their people is mainly through curates, secretaries, and parish-visitors, rather than the daily intercourse in home and store and factory that brings the priest into the real lives of his spiritual children, we hear an insistent cry for "greater flexibility in the use of the Prayer Book"; that is to say, for the increase of permissive variations in our service. I think this voices a need really felt by our clergy, especially those who are in the habit of reading the Daily Office. It is a recrudescence of the same tendency that made the mediæval Breviary such a complication of minute variations. But I

do not think, and the experience of ten years as a mission priest tends to verify the conclusion, that it is needed or desired at all by the laity. As I said just now, each layman expects to be able to go through the world, finding the service of his home parish exactly reproduced in every church he enters. He is distressed if he is unable to turn at once to the proper place, and find each part of the service without any assistance from the pews, or giving out of pages from the chancel. Our present use allows of a very great flexibility indeed, especially in Evening Prayer; and ever since I have been ordained I have made the fullest use of this flexibility and of the resulting variety of service. But I must admit that, beyond the fact that I have been thereby more personally edified, the only tangible result has been the opportunity, nay the necessity, for many long and minute explanations; explanations necessary to keep individuals, or even whole families, from drifting away. Old and faithful Church people are puzzled rather than edified, and hurt rather than pleased, by the variability of the existing service. Every contact with the coming and going laity of an industrial mission-parish has steadily enforced this conclusion: that "greater flexibility" is a need of the clerical, and more rigid uniformity of the lay, mind.

Now the advocates of "flexibility" do really intend to represent the layman's point of view; only they are endeavoring to speak from the standpoint, not so much of the Churchman as of the stranger within our gates. He usually professes his fear of the deadening effect of repeating the same service, Sunday after Sunday, and talks about liturgical forms as a kind of spiritual straightjacket. In the interest of impressing him with the real freedom of the soul that comes from liturgical worship, we are asked to forego our own instinctive desire for uniformity. But we

forget that this disapproving stranger could not possibly perceive his supposedly desired flexibility, unless he were to make frequent visits to the Church, and be in a position to compare service with service. We forget that his real objection is to any liturgy whatever; and that a highly variable service, with its inevitably increased difficulty of finding the place, would be more apt to impress him with a sense of mechanical fuss than of spiritual freedom in worship. The man used to seeing his Minister in coat and trousers sees no difference between a chasuble and a Doctor's hood. The man who doubts the efficacy of written prayers would find the same objection to a flexible as to a rigid liturgy; that it is a liturgy. The Protestant visitor finds his difficulty in the fact that he has never been taught to use forms of prayer as a vehicle for spiritual expression; and unless the congregation be conspicuously devout, or the music very good, he must sit, bored and restless, wondering when they will ever get to the sermon, which is to him the real business of the meeting.

This shows us the only way in which a greater flexibility would help the domestic missionary. It would enable him to shorten the service in the interest of those who may be taking part in the Church's worship for the first time. But it would enable him to do so only at the cost of sacrificing the comfort and edification of the little group of old-time Churchmen, who are, after all, the foundation on which he must build; and who have rights he must not violate. Here is the difficulty the mission priest must face. The desire to reproduce old home conditions has probably saddled him with a vested choir, in a cure too small to furnish sufficient good singers for such a choir. Their performance can at best hope to be such as would interest only those who love a vested choir for its vestedness, irrespective of the musical

quality of its work. For the sake of these same traditional Churchmen the whole office must be discharged, without disturbing omissions or unusual changes. But the strangers come and go, so oppressed with the length of the service that it would take an orator eloquent indeed to hold them simply by the power of his preaching, and bring them back to sit through that service again and again, until they learn to love it too. Moreover, the Protestant misses the personal touch, the homelike atmosphere; and unless his be an *anima naturaliter catholica*, or the manner of conducting the service be of a dignity, orderliness, and impressiveness, far beyond the resources of the usual mission church, he fails to find in this (to him) new method of religion anything to compensate him for the loss of his cherished homelike informality. The services of a parochial mission, with their direct personal intercessions, their straightforward preaching and teaching, and their informal simplicity and naturalness, speak more directly to his heart than the best the usual small church has to offer. The key to the problem, then, is to find some way of combining the informal personal directness of the mission with the regularity and dignity of the Prayer Book Service.

Taking the Prayer Book as it now stands, with just one element drawn from the proposed changes accepted in 1916, we can find a way in which this could be accomplished. Recognizing that the services of Ordination are unavoidably long and, even with a Virginian simplicity, more or less elaborate, the Church has directed that at such services the sermon shall be preached separately, before the beginning of the service proper. Thus those who may be presumably prevented from staying through the whole of the ceremonies can still learn the spiritual lessons they are designed to teach; and those who desire pure worship, undis-

turbed by instruction and exhortation, can also obtain their desire. If some such permission were granted to our congregations, especially in our mission churches, the problem would be solved; and solved much better than by hacking and twisting the offices, to assimilate them to the form of the usual Protestant meeting, until they are unrecognizable by trained Churchmen. The plan I am advocating is, briefly, to permit the clergy, especially in mission churches, to preach before instead of during or after service. The order of service would be about like this: At the end of the processional hymn the Priest goes to the pulpit, where he gives out the notices, and reads a short Scripture lesson. He then says the Bidding Prayer, adding direct intercessions as they may be requested or needed, and proceeds to the sermon. After the sermon a hymn should be given out, and the alms collected, but not offered, after which the Priest, still in the pupit, should say one collect and give a blessing. The stranger, for whom the service as he undestands it is now concluded, is at liberty to withdraw. At the same time he has learned from the notices that this is not the end of the services, that the real business of the gathering is still to come. He is at liberty to remain, and he actually will remain, in a much better frame of mind to be touched by the service following than if he is sitting as a young Protestant once said to me: "wondering when they will get through reading the minutes and get to the business of the meeting." Meanwhile the Introit or other hymn is sung, followed by the Liturgy or Office as the case may be, said without breaks or omissions, even the previously collected alms being presented at the usual time.

In this way the informality of the parochial mission type of service, and by using special intercessions in the Bidding Prayer its directness, can most fittingly be combined with

the dignity and beauty of liturgical worship. By this arrangement the stranger can be brought to hear some part of our message in a more receptive attitude than if he must first be (let us honestly admit it, for they often say so) bored by having to wait through a long service he does not understand for the one form of its presentation he will listen to. At the same time the Churchman is not, by this arrangement, deprived of his right of assistance at the Church's worship in its entiretly, unspoiled by omissions in the supposed interest of "making the service more attractive," to those whose training has unfitted them for its use. or indeed for any worship as we understand the term. Could not the revision of our general rubrics provide permission for such an order of the service where it is thought desirable? Is it not desirable, not merely from the point of view of interesting potential converts, but of Christian hospitality? It could be done now, under the existing rubrics, without violating the letter of the law, but a truly Catholic Priest surely would desire rather to be following the Church's expressed mind than merely to be doing something which she does not forbid.

The Kenotic Theory

By Rev. Albert Farr.

THE interest in what is called the Kenosis is a modern one. We are impressed by the simplicity and the reserve of the Evangelists, who left a faithful record of the earthly life of Jesus Christ as they had known Him both in respect to His true human life of struggle and sympathy and in respect to His heavenly might and deeds of wonder. The early Church in the presence of the Incarnate

Word simply loved and worshipped the Person with whom they had companied: they are "witnesses of these things."

His followers record human weariness, thirst, a longing for human companionship, indignation, a real birth, boyhood, youth, a real death and burial; and along with this they present an all-powerful Healer, One who remits sins, One who raises the dead, who teaches with utter authority, who speaks of Himself as substantial Deity, and who rises from the grave victorious. Not by flesh and blood,—sense apprehension,—do they recognize the Son of God; but little by little it is revealed to them that the man Jesus whom they had touched and handled is somehow God in human form. They were content with this "unspeakable gift" and their chief feelings were of awe, of wonder, of joy. They simply tried to live His life and do His works, not trying to inquire into forbidden things.

We shall inquire in this paper if their approach is the true one; working intensely upon what is revealed and not scattering our forces, in vain pursuit of the unknowable. And let it be observed that the solid warm theological writings were from the patristic period when the Church put her intellect and heart upon the "faith once delivered." In modern times the tendency is to wax enthusiastic over the geography and customs of the future life, leaving grossly neglected weightier matters of law and faith.

The Apostolic Church believed in the true and permanent Godhead of Jesus Christ, who exercised powers that are at once His own and divine. On the other hand, it appears from the Gospel records that the Incarnate never for a moment acted godward or manward apart from His manhood. These two sets of facts emerge from our study of the Gospels, reinforced by hints from St. Paul and other N. T. writers.

The great Creeds of Christendom, symbols or "indirect descriptions of truth," were hedges put up by the Church Councils to preserve from spoliation the pastures of N. T. teaching.

The Creeds were not the result of wilful dogmatizing on the part of the Church; but when here and there men held up spurious portraits of our Lord, the Church was bound to reject what was unworthy and hold up the true portrait. The Creeds were these articulations; the language used being that of the time which happened to be perfect for metaphysical distinctness of expression. We have no celestial language, so that the words of the Creeds are true but inadequate, considered absolutely: they are metaphors, i. e. they mean all we think they do and a great deal more.

Hooker's phrase epitomizes the decisions of the undivided Church as to the hypostatic union. He was "truly" God; He was "perfectly" man; He was "indivisibly" One and He was "distinctly" of two natures. Human language cannot surpass the well-balanced statements such as we find in the Athanasian Symbol, in the Creed of Chalcedon, and in the Tome of St. Leo. Once for all, the Church rejected the doctrine of one will (Monothelite), saying that our Lord possesses two wills, human and divine; she rejected the Monophysite heresy which appeared in many forms, such as the teachings of Apollinaris who out of reverence for the Deity of Christ denied His true human nature; her ultimate formula was two natures, two energies, two wills, one Person. The title *Theotókos* was defended, which means that He whom the Blessed Mary bore was very God of very God.

The Kenotic Theory we said above is modern. It had its rise from the Christology of Martin Luther whose conception of the *communicatio idiomatum* was mistakenly that the Incarnation caused an imparting of the Divine attri-

butes to the manhood and, in controversy with Zwingli, asserting the ubiquity of the manhood. The true doctrine is of course that what you say of either nature you say of the one Person who possesses the two natures.

The old approach to the Incarnation was from the point of view of our Lord's person; the Kenotic approach is unfortunately from the two natures. The Giessen school held that there were two states, an earthly one in which the Divine attributes were in abeyance, and the heavenly state in which these attributes were won back: this led to an idea of a progressive Incarnation. The main movement of Kenoticism originated about 1830. In harmony with the biological orgy and worship of Science spelt large, men's minds were occupied with the ethical aspects of the Incarnation to the disfavor of the metaphysical. Men were sincerely desirous to emphasize the real growth of Jesus, His real struggle in temptation, His perfect humanity in short; and they called in the Kenotic Theory to help them. Then there was the question of our Lord's human faith as well as the evidences of certain limitations of knowledge, notably His confessed ignorance as to the exact hour of the Day of Judgment.

The Kenotic Theories were first common in Germany and then flourished in England and here. It is safe to say that they have in one form or another taken possession of a large section of Anglican Christendom. It is a not unexpected reaction from the crude dualistic notions held in regard to the Christology of Chalcedon.

It was felt that some "emptying" of divine glory was necessary in order for our Lord to be of such entire humanity as to be a true example for us. The movement centered around the passage of St. Paul in Phil. 2:7. From this one verse largely, the wish being father to the thought, men

have evolved various theories, ranging from the nearly orthodox position to the most dangerous recrudescence of ancient heresies.

Bishop Gore took the position that for love of us Jesus Christ abjured the prerogatives of equality with God which He possessed before all worlds and by an act of deliberate self-abnegation He so emptied Himself as to assume the permanent characteristics of the human state: He took the form of a servant. "Thus remaining in unchanged personality He abandoned certain prerogatives of the divine mode of existence in order to assume the human." The old saying of the fathers is better in its reserve: "Remaining what He was, He became what He was not." The weak point in Bishop Gore's argument is that the idea of abandonment necessitates a conception of two kinds of consciousness in the one eternal Son.

The normal Kenotic theory is that the Son abandoned certain attributes called physical, such as omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence. The Son thus ceases to exercise His eternal activities toward creation. Such is the view of Principal Fairbairn, following Thomasius. But the result is, as with Dr. Gore, a dual consciousness of the Christ. Gess and Godet, the latter being of influence among Anglicans, hold that the Son also surrendered the moral attributes of God and ceased from His life in the Divine Being for thirty-three years. This view avoids the duality of consciousness of Christ, but it endangers the dogma of God's Being. Others like Clarke speak of abandonment of the physical attributes and postulate a new kind of person, a composite consciousness, part human, part divine. Martensen is homeopathic in his idea of a partial abandonment of physical attributes and argues for a twofold consciousness of the eternal Son. His weak point is his reference to

a human individuality. Bishop Weston has a fairly orthodox theory: rejecting all idea of abandonment, composite personality, etc., he says that "the Logos in His state of Divine glory, possesses a true consciousness of Himself as God the Son, all-powerful and all-loving." But "He ever imposes upon Himself a law of self-restraint so framed that in the Incarnate state His exercise of His own proper powers is at every moment to be adapted to the measure of the capacity of His evergrowing manhood." Ottley maintains, that since love is the supreme Divine attribute (compare Collect for Eleventh Trinity), metaphysical considerations must give way in the interests of a real display of pity. It is a characteristic of Anglican Kenoticists to emphasize the voluntariness of the Kenosis.

These theories are innumerable and widespread. When I began this study I felt that an un-Kenotic conception of Christ was crude and unreal, depriving the human life of Christ of any real power of example. But I have carefully studied the theories, the best and the worst, and they fail at this or that point in giving due dignity to the Being of God or due scope to the redemption of our entire nature. It will be best then, having stated the principal theories of Kenosis to consider at once the key-passage in Phil. 2: 5-11.

We must take this passage of St. Paul in connection with the context. He is obviously speaking of humility and exhorting by the example of Christ that each should count others better than himself and look not only on his own things but also on the things of others. Then comes the illustration of the text: let us translate, "Who being in the form of God (entitled to divine honor) counted it not a prize to be grasped, or He did not reckon His equality with God to consist in grasping (for human repute), (but on the contrary) He effaced Himself or made Himself of no

reputation (surrendering all anxiety concerning His personal glory), He took the form of a servant, becoming in the likeness of sinful men (a form and a likeness to which no honor was likely to be paid)", etc. So that St. Paul is here exhorting us to do habitually what our Lord did in His Incarnate life. The word *and* also is evidential. We are certainly not to abandon our own things in favor of others for impoverishment of us will not help others, but we are to be so free from anxious care about them as would allow us to look also to the things of others. The word *kenóo* does have a metaphorical use and St. Paul nowhere uses it literally: in late Greek the word had come to mean "to make void," "to nullify" rather than to make "empty." We remember here St. Paul's explicit doctrine of Christ that in Him "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." "Form of God" means something inseparable from God. It means "subsisting all along in the essence of God." As for grasping for external honors St. Paul shows that our proper status is secure and cannot be jeopardized by our thoughtfulness of others.

If we interpret *ekénosen* literally, what did the Logos abandon? Either the form of God, which is an equivalent to an abandonment of godhead, which most men would reject; or His being on an equality with God. But there was no such abandonment of the latter, for to the Father Christ was no less glorious after His earthly humiliation. And as for the glory He received from men He did not receive it until it was given Him as a recognition of His perfect obedience in the manhood. His humiliation was a real submission to the limitations of our human nature and experience, *as touching the manhood* which He assumed. If we add *as touching the Godhead* we empty the Incarnation of worth, for such a Person would not be full God and there-

fore not a Revealer in human flesh of God's utter love for us. We will preserve clear thought on the question of Christ's eternal glory if we reject the misleading postulate of Luther that the Incarnation is a communication of divine properties to human nature. Our Lord "disparaged Himself" and became inferior to the Father as touching His manhood. Is not this what Christ means when He says to the young man, "Why callest thou me (my human nature) good?" "There is none good but God." That is, the Son of God could not have been what He was apart from His divine Self. St. Cyril said, to translate truly, that Christ "suffered the measures of our manhood to prevail in His own case." "While made a man, He remained what He was, God." We cannot even understand what is meant by some Kenoticists who say He remained who He was but not what He was. We cannot hold, if we believe in the two whole and perfect natures, that His possession of one of these natures has suffered reduction by His condescension in assuming the other. St. Leo says truly, "Each form (nature) does what is proper to it in communion with the other (grace of union)."

Let us proceed to consider the relations between the natures of our Lord. He is of one substance with the Father as touching His Godhead and He is of one substance with us men as touching His manhood. We start from this. He has two natures, two wills, two energies, two knowledges. We must hold such doctrine after the manner of the well-balanced early fathers which will not involve the overshadowing of His human limitations by His divine omniscience nor can we suffer His "fulness of Godhead" to be in any measure reduced in His precious manhood.

The fourth General Council affirmed "One only Christ, acknowledged to be in two natures, without confusion,

without conversion, without division, without separation, the difference of natures not being in any wise annulled by reason of the Union, but rather the properties of both natures being preserved and meeting in one Person and one hypostasis." Of these two natures there is one subject or self and He is the divine Logos or Son. The modern approach is from dual consciousness, etc., to a possible determining subject or self. Catholic theology rightly starts with the One Christ, for certainly that is the ingenuous human way that the disciples followed; and why is not the truly rational method for us to start, so far as is possible, from their position?

In the one Self or Subject each nature retains its integrity and operation. We know of no such hybrid things as a composite totality, resulting from a fusion of the two natures. Rather is it true that at the proper time the one divine Subject does now what is proper to manhood and now what is proper to Deity. The same Self who is weary in the boat, as touching His manhood, rises presently and rebukes the waves, as touching divine power. The One Christ weeps humanly over Lazaurus' grave and presently the same Person uses divine power unreduced to raise Lazarus to life and health. The unity of Person as recorded in Scripture is unmistakable and we import difficulties into the situation by our fond insistence on using modern methods of "science" and current psychological theories which change overnight. Person is the best word the Nicene theologians had to hand. They affirmed that an eternal self of the Godhead has entered into history: the Word, logical, integral, eternal, was made flesh. Without ceasing to be a Self of Godhead, He has also become the Self of real manhood. He did not give up His own Deity but He hallowed

our humanity by His assumption of it and all its struggles, truly as we are except for sin.

We err in drawing lines between the two consciousnesses of Christ: (1) if we draw a perpendicular line between the human and divine we have two Christs and not One, and (2) if we draw a horizontal line we find ourselves in equal difficulty. We must beware of regionary or spatial descriptions of the human mind. The divine is central, the human circumferential, not in a regionary sense at all, but as looking inward toward the invisible and determining Self of our Lord.

It is true that Sanday's use of the subconscious mind is a help toward seeing at least how it *is possible* for Deity to be the invisible and powerful Self of an awaking and awakened manhood. Our subliminal mind, of which we know little, is no mere silent partner but it is our well of life from which we take and to which we give. And here is where the theory applied to Christ is dangerous, for surely His manhood could not add anything to His Blessed Deity. A far better figure, avoiding the dangers of psychological terms, is the figure of the circumference of a circle and its center, the center being without dimensions and the circumference being determined by the center, the Divine Self or Ego.

In our human lives our self is not to be measured by what we are externally in our functioning, and in the Son of God it is presumptuous for us to seek to measure or to circumscribe His Self or Deity. His Self is the eternal Son and His functioning is through His assumed manhood in which He offered Himself first as a sacrifice for sin and then as an ensample of godly life. Sanday speaks of the divine operating "deep down at the roots of being" so as to perfect without subverting the human. The right description of

this operation on manhood in Christ is the old theological phrase, "grace of union."

Dr. Moberly has pointed out in his masterly "Atonement and Personality" how little we know of either the divine or the human personality, how rich personality may be in its developed perfection. Our human personality is imperfect, clouded by sin, and we cannot speak disparagingly of divine personalities when we as yet have no adequate conception of what human personality may be.

Now our Lord's life and works on earth were of course inspired by the blessed Holy Ghost, He having in full measure what we have imperfectly, due to our smallness of capacity. The Father gave Him the Holy Spirit "without measure." But we must not think of the Incarnate life as being only the work of the Holy Ghost. For inasmuch as the manhood of Christ was assumed and determined by the eternal Son, what Christ did, God was doing in Him; Christ's words of life and power were God's very thought articulated for human ken: He is the eternal Logos; His obedience was real and His endurance. He assumed once for all our full manhood except for sin. If we say He did not have a real feeling for our infirmities because of his sinlessness (He could not sin), we reply that the man who feels the full force and terror of sin is the man who does not yield, for he holds out longer and the struggle increases in intensity. And we know little of what torture sin may present in temptation to utter purity.

Christ redeemed our entire human nature, for He assumed a real but impersonal manhood; the Logos did not inhabit a human individual, for then only one man would have been saved and we would have seen enacted a counsel of despair. Not only is He an "ensample," but being the Son of God, effective power flows out from Him to us by

virtue of sacramental infusion of His precious Body and Blood. And the manhood which He assumed is ascended and glorified forever at God's right hand. He is the true "Forerunner" (so Swete) going to prepare a place for us, and "justification" simply means that God the Father sees in Christ what manhood is capable of by grace of His example and life-giving power.

The difficulties as to the limitations of Christ's knowledge are academic rather than vital. He did not know of the hour of the day of judgment simply because the Father in His wisdom had not so ordered it that such knowledge could be mediated by the manhood of Christ. Can one say it was an ignorance due to the economy of God, rather than to any defect or imperfection on the part of the Son? He expressed feelings of surprise often, yet nothing here is antithetical to perfect manhood and in close connection with such surprise we read of His perfect insight into men's minds and hearts. Sometimes of course He asked questions in Socratic fashion to try men's faith, "for He Himself knew what He would do." He quoted from the Psalms and from "Moses," etc., giving the accepted authorship, not because He *could not have given* literally accurate historical criticisms but because He did not come to incarnate higher criticism but the life of God. Consequently He did not reveal anything which would unduly disturb men's minds or preclude human endeavor and research. His central purpose was to save men and no alleged "ignorance" on His part seems to militate against His divine purpose "for us men and for our salvation."

The statements in Luke 2:52, etc., as to an "increase in wisdom and stature" argue for a real human growth and while there was no such thing as a progressive Incarnation, He did "increase in favor with God and man" because by

grace of union His human life was perfect at its own proper time. There was always great power and beauty in that Holy life but it was mediated by a manhood which was perfect in its growth and development, supernatural yet not unnatural. The Son was eternally perfect but in the sphere of the Incarnation that perfection had to be expressed in terms of human growth and understanding.

We cannot hope to envisage His Blessed Person other than did His disciples who adored in Him the very life and power of Jehovah and who yet lay on His bosom, were called "Comrades" by Him, and saw their feet washed by His own hands. They stood in awe and worship before the very One whom they sometimes rebuked and counselled. "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he?" The Son of David! The Son of God! Born of a maiden of very flesh and conceived by the Holy Ghost so that "that Holy Thing" in the womb of Holy Mary was the eternal Logos of God: Christ's Self was divine.

Not infrequently do harassed people ask me, "Where do you place Christ?" They try to make Him mere man, it will not do; they attempt with unreasoning reverence to make Him an Arian demi-god, but this is fatal to any true idea of Deity. No *tertium quid* or composite totality will endure the test of study. Taking His life as we see it in the New Testament and as we have it epitomized and safeguarded in the Creeds, and last not least as we see it in embryo in our own religious experience, Christ in us the hope of glory, we must acknowledge in humble faith and friendship that the Son of God was and is the Son of Man. He spoke of Himself with gracious modesty as Son of Man, thereby hallowing our human nature; we in turn give Him His eternal title, true Son of God, the Father's Word.

Men have many insoluble problems but most of them are problems of academic circles and not of real life. "We know now in part" by God's wise decree; we shall know hereafter as we are known. We shall never know the *manner* of the Incarnation until (if then) the seed of Christ planted in us shall in good time come to the flower of perfection.

But we must reject each and every theory of the Kenosis as unscriptural, undogmatic, unpatristic and metaphysically untenable. It is a "mystery" revealed in part; and like the ancients we must simply say, the Son of God is Son of Man; no hyphen even, no lines up or across. It is a mystery like the relation of God's love and His Power; we do not know much of either love or power, so as Hooker says, "Our safest eloquence is silence." The same is true of the *manner* in which the manhood of the Blessed Christ is joined to His Godhead. Angels in vain seek to look into it. Let us be content with the fact, with the gift, saying "Thanks be to God Who hath given this great power to men!" It is ungracious and irrational to probe into the manner of the giving and it is undoubtedly one of the things which the Apostle Peter suggests are closed to our inquiry, simply because the Creature cannot look upon the face of God in this life and live.

Apocalyptic Literature in the Bible

By Rev. Arthur Chase.

ONE may safely declare that it is the unanimous opinion of scholars today that Holy Scripture, in order to be understood, must be approached and studied under the usual canons of literature. This is far from saying that it is to be studied as "mere literature." Its preeminence for us is not literary, but moral and spiritual. But the approach must be made as to any other body of writings, if its moral and spiritual preeminence is to be properly appreciated. We must approach the Hebrew writings as we do the Greek, not as a unity, but as a collection of literary units. Each author or group of authors must be found alone, not forgetting, however, the corporate mind and will of the nation. Thus Isaiah must be studied as one studies Demosthenes; Job as Aeschylus and the contemporary dramatists.

We all recognize that there is in the Bible a variety of distinct literary forms. During the first century the epistolary form was almost as universal and popular as a means of expression as the novel in our day, and the greater portion of the New Testament writers employed it simply and naturally.

During the Old Testament period we find, in the literary world, the chronicle, the oration, the drama, the lyric,—all of them exemplified in Hebrew writings as well as in those of classic Greece. One other literary form there is which is peculiar to Judaism,—the Apocalypse. This is a creation of Judaism, and belongs to it as distinctively as the creation of the drama belongs to Greece.

The Apocalypse is a great literary *act of faith.* It is the

product of a corporate religious imagination. In utter and absolute despair of the present, it capitalizes the future, and assures to men a right of way into and even through that future. And being this, it is distinctly God's message to His own people.

As we consider this form of literary expression, let us not forget that ancient saying of the Rabbins, "God speaks in the dialects of the sons of men."

There are two great examples of apocalyptic literature; that which bears the name of Daniel, and that which is called "The Revelation of St. John." These two, aside from the fact that they are canonical books, stand like mountain peaks above all other apocalyptic literature. Each was called forth by a tremendous crisis, the one in the history of the Jewish, the other of the Christian Church; a crisis in each case in which the very existence of the Church was threatened.

The Book of Daniel belongs to the second century before Christ.* Let us get at the historical situation.

The period of Prophetism closes with the end of the exile. For the nation it was the period of moral inspiration. After it follows the period of Law. Law was being developed, expanded, extended. During this period the Jew was learning the great lesson that law is sacred, that to be true law it must and does reflect the will of God. It is worth our attention that the entire body of Hebrew jurisprudence was incorporated in their canon of Scripture.

The Exile destroyed the hope and possibility of monarchy for the people of Israel. What that meant to an oriental people may be illustrated by what it means to a colony of bees to lose its queen. The corporate head is gone. The

* See Driver's "Introduction."

Exile also destroyed the territorial basis of the Jews, and created the Diaspora. Thus the problem became this: How to maintain the corporate unity of the nation. The difficulty of maintaining corporate unity will be appreciated when one thinks of the geographical situation of Judaea, with its population of only a few millions at most, at the very crossroads of the great powers of the ancient world, the meeting place and battle ground of the world armies.

By B. C. 200 the great problem of Law was answered. The canon of Old Testament Scripture was the Constitution of the Chosen People. Now comes contact with Hellenism.

Alexander the Great, born B. C. 356, had swept over the known world. He and his successors founded Greek cities wherever his arms had prevailed. A dozen such cities grew up east and west of the Jordan.

Now Hellenism was not only a military force. It was also an almost irresistible cultural appeal, and for this reason doubly dangerous to the intellectual Hebrew. By B. C. 250 Hellenism as a cultural appeal had captured the aristocracy and the higher priesthood; and the very backbone was going out of Judaism.

At the beginning of the second century, B. C., there arises Antiochus Epiphanes, of the Graeco-Syrian Empire. He proposed no less a program than the wiping out of Judaism. He was the *enfant terrible* of his time, and blurted his plan right out. He would wipe Judaism from the face of the earth. He proceeded to put his plan into effect, and ordered his own statue to be erected for worship within the sacred precincts of the Temple, — the "Abomination of Desolation."

His friends called him Epiphanes,—the Illustrious. His

enemies changed two letters and made it Epimanes,—the Madman.

The story is told of a Protestant pastor who was once engaged in an argument with the Duc de Guise—a perilous occupation for a commoner. The Duc grew furiously angry as he was worsted in the argument, and leaping to his feet exclaimed, "By God, I'll smash you." The pastor quietly replied, "Sir, the Church of Christ has smashed many a hammer."

The Church of God and of the Jews smashed Antiochus with the Book of Daniel, which was the outcome of the policy of Antiochus. Rightly understood it is one of the supreme books of history. It is the product of the constructive imagination of an unknown scribe of the second century, B. C., who, in despair of the present, in spite of its desolate hopelessness, capitalized the future. This poet-prophet claims the dark unknown future for God and the Church. The Book of Daniel was the great inevitable act of the constructive religious imagination, expressing the corporate faith, the unerring certainty of the faithful remnant of the true Israel.

God sometimes, indeed, goes straight at the mark like a crashing cannon ball, but not often. His is the roundabout, devious way, like that of His rivers as they seek the sea. So it is here.

The Apocalypse of Daniel must not be judged either as prophecy or as religion, but as *a dramatic visualization of the inevitable.* For God's redemptive purpose it is concerned with the ultimate things.

When we realize that the Book as we have it was written 400 years after Daniel of the Captivity lived, we can answer all fanciful objectors who come forward with the bugaboo of "literary dishonesty." Men of today do not

plagiarize Milton, or Christopher Columbus. Daniel the man, together with the common tradition contained in the first chapter, is merely the framework with which the sculptor starts when he models a figure. The author was deceiving his age about as much as was Rafael when he painted some peasant-mother with her baby, and called it the Virgin and Child.

It was really a stroke of genius, — that throwing the story, or its framework, back 400 years to a time when Israel had been threatened by a crisis no less perilous than that which now threatened her. God's carrying His Church through that crisis would strengthen the prophetic faith of this period which produced the Apocalypse of Daniel.

We are now prepared, I hope, to understand at least part of the imagery of the Book.

After the introduction, the Book becomes instinct with the arrogance of those in power. The pagan despot is shown demanding so absurd a thing as the interpretation of a dream that he has forgotten. Then comes the dream: A great image with head of gold, breast of silver, thighs of brass, and feet of clay. It symbolizes world-power; materialism, and militarism; especially the latter. But the little stone "cut out without hands," representing the Kingdom of God, beats the feet to pieces, that the image falls. Before that stone all earthly powers must ultimately fall.

Another picture follows, that of the Fiery Furnace, which stands for world-power and brute force. It also stands for the heat of fierce competition, and the fire of heartless strife. But put inside it real values, values that are eternal, and the flame has no power to destroy, for real values are indestructible. Bearing this in mind, the Song of the Three Children, "O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye

the Lord," becomes the very mountain top of poetic imagination. It is our rejoicing together with one who is "like unto a son of God."

The den of lions is greed and lust and devouring worldliness, which cannot kill the Spirit of the living God, though that Spirit be cast into its very midst.

It is not wise to inquire too particularly into the meaning of the "times and half times" that apocalyptic writers employed. Such phrases belonged to the particular style of composition, and were used with the express purpose of vagueness and indefiniteness. God's future may not be peered into too critically or definitely. Reverence calls for figurative language.

By the power of religious imagination heart was kept in the despairing remnant of Judaism. It was God's instrument for saving His Church. It discounts the present; it draws upon the future. That ancient Scribe, the unknown author of the Book, sums the whole matter up at the end: "Blessed is he that waiteth; . . . Thou shalt rest, and shalt stand in thy lot at the end of the days."

The other great example of apocalyptic literature is the Book of the Revelation of St. John. Between it and Daniel there is a striking parallel, both in the conditions that brought it forth, and in the end which it aims to accomplish.

The impersonality of Daniel absolutely conceals the author, and makes the date of its composition difficult to ascertain. In Revelation there is a splendid impersonality of authorship, even as there is in the Synoptic Gospels. Except for what tradition tells us we are in the dark. But behind the author stands the Apostolic Church. A mere individual cannot produce a great classic. He must be working in, and must speak as the mouthpiece of, a su-

preme group. Such a group, engaged in a terrific conflict, was the Apostolic Church, and out of the conflict emerged both Synoptics and Apocalypse.

The Revelation of St. John is beaten out on the anvil of the life and death struggle between the Christian Church and the Roman Empire. We are likely to take that struggle for granted without half asking the question, — Why was there such a struggle at all? There must be some real and adequate explanation of the fact that there was such a struggle. Where shall we look for it?

We shall find that the deadly struggle is rooted in the ingrained, fundamental conception of antiquity that *Church and State are one.* To prove this would take me far afield. But if you would realize the truth of the statement, you must read deep into the heart of antiquity. You will get the conviction at first hand if you read the older Greek poets, and particularly the Greek dramatists. You will find there that it simply is so. The fact stands patent. Not a union of Church and State, but an identity. You may get it at second hand from such books as Robertson Smith's "Religion of the Semites," and more definitely from DeCoulanges' "Ancient City."

At the time of the Christian Era the old paganism of Rome had died out. Religion had become an empty form, without content or conviction. Its moral power had ceased. A new paganism was coming in consisting of the deification of the Emperor. The aim was to make this the universal religion of the civilized world. But universality was likewise the watchword and aim of Christianity. Therefore we have the paradox of two irresistible forces in life and death struggle. On the face of it there could be no doubt that the Empire would have the best of the conflict. It is certain that she had the largest battalions!

The part which Antiochus Epiphanes played in the old struggle between the Church of God and Hellenism is played by the Emperor Caligula in this later contest. Caligula, who ascended the throne of the Empire in A. D. 37, was also an *enfant terrible.* And he too blunderingly announced his determination to erect a statue of himself for state worship in the holy precincts of the Temple at Jerusalem. (We need to remember that the Christian Church was still Jewish at this time.)

The Procurator of Judaea, knowing somewhat of the temper of the Jews, on one pretext and another put off and put off the fulfilment of the imperial order, until Caligula was most happily assassinated in the year 41.

But vast ferments were working, and the climax came, a staggering event to Jew and Christian, in the destruction of Jerusalem in the years 70 and 71. There went the territorial basis to smash—both for Judaism and for Christianity. Persecution of Christians raged on all sides. The Church's center, firmly established at Jerusalem, was gone. The Church had no center, no visible organization. Its very foundations were crumbling. Humanly speaking it was doomed to a speedy extinction. And yet, the Gospel, that entity far larger than the Gospels, was the glowing, the irresistible conviction of the ultimate reality of the Kingdom of God; that that is the only real thing; the only thing that counts; the one absolute value.

Out of this white hot conviction sprang the Apocalypse of St. John. In absolute, utter despair of the present it seizes upon the dark future, and claims it for God and for God's chosen. It is the result of the conflict between the Christ and the Caesar for the headship of humanity. It comes forth out of one of the most dramatic situations in history.

If we grasp these points, then the question of authorship becomes largely academic. The Book has the Apostolic Church behind it, and we may fearlessly place it as the work of St. John and of his "school" of Asia Minor, which was the focal point of the Church in the first century, as Egypt was in the second. Ephesus was the strategic center, and there, doubtless, the book grew, and went through various editions.

One must not, of course, dream of studying the Apocalypse as a body of prediction. It was not meant for that. It is rather a dramatic declaration of the great inevitable things, white hot in its earnestness and conception, magnificent in its fancy and its figures of speech.

Let me illustrate the white heat at which the author wrote, by Rev. 11:17:—"I will give him a white stone, and in that stone a new name written." A thought had flashed into the writer's mind. Before it gets off the pen another crowds forward, and the two go down together. The first figure is that of a trial at law. In the Greek courts the jurors voted by casting small stones into a jar,—white for acquittal, black for conviction. If the vote were a tie, the Divinity interferes, casts a white stone, and secures acquittal.* But as the thought takes shape, a new idea flashes. The white stone is not only God's vote, but the clean white tablet of the heart, written upon by the finger of God with the very essence of divine truth,—the Name, which, to the man who alone may read it, stands for inward conviction.

To understand the Book in detail we must regain the point of view of the age that produced it.

The first portion of the Book, the "Letters to the Seven

* See "The Eumenides" of Aeschylus.

Churches," is almost certainly from the hand of St. John himself. These chapters are addressed to certain definite conditions in representative congregations. The constant refrain is—Wait! Hold fast! Be faithful! Be patient, and Wait!

In chapter 11 we read of the measuring of the New Jerusalem with the cubit, the "measure of a man or of an angel." What is this but the doctrine of Protagoras that man is the measure of all things? — man filled with a new dignity, since God has entered into humanity.

In chapter 12 we behold the genius of the new religion: The Church as a noble woman, pregnant with the humanity that is to be. The sun, the moon and the stars witness to her purity and beauty. This is the climax of the poetics of Scripture.

And last of all, the City of God is seen, actually seen coming down out of heaven, glorious, triumphant. The burning conviction of the Church visualized the dim future as a present event. The essential reality of the ages was present to the eye of faith and sure confidence in God.

It is that conviction that men live by at all times, but especially in times of severest testing. Possessing it, one knows that God will win out. And so he sees the banners of God's victory in the sky.

Some Early Commencements

By Rev. Arthur Whipple Jenks, D.D.

THE romance of institutions, as of people and nations, is to be looked for in the earlier years of their history. Or it may be that we look back over the intervening years through rose-colored spectacles. The General Theological Seminary whose home is in Chelsea Square, New York City, has recently completed a century of life, and in view of this mile-stone just turned there is a special interest in recalling some incidents in the early period of the Seminary and in allowing the tinge of romantic imagination and afterglow to rest upon them amid the all too drab aspects of the Church and the world today.

The formal records of the Board of Trustees of course are without local color. But the newspapers and periodicals of the day furnish information interesting and valuable for gaining a knowledge of the interior life of the Seminary and afford precious glimpses of the early days. The Seminary a century ago was an institution recognized as of outstanding importance. Its annual Commencements were notable events. The secular papers as well as the religious press, even outside New York, set aside considerable space for the chronicle of events in its development and history. To be sure the columns were often given over to attacks and controversies. A tale might be unfolded of dark and awful things charged against the personnel and activities of this School of the Prophets which in those days made the hair of Churchmen stand on end with horror at the apeing of the "Scarlet Woman," but in these commonplace days evoke only an audible smile and tears of mirth. It is worth while, however, to chronicle some interesting and amusing details

of Commencements in the first quarter of a century of the Seminary's history.

We are fortunate in having a fairly full account of the first Annual Commencement, held on July 30, 1824. Of course no Chapel or other suitable building for the exercises existed at that time in Chelsea Square. The service was held in Christ Church, then situated far down town. The following was the order of procedure. "The Bishops, other Clergy, Trustees, Faculty, and Students assembled near Christ Church and thence walked in procession to the Church. The following arrangement was adopted on the occasion:—Order of Exercises. As the procession enters, a Voluntary on the Organ. Introductory Devotions by the presiding Bishop. Singing—last four verses of the 122d Psalm, with the Gloria Patri. (We wonder why in the short Psalm of nine verses only the final four were used. Was it that those present could not conscientiously say, "I was glad when they said unto me: We will go into the house of the Lord"?) Next came the Dissertations, and we note the custom from the very first of inflicting the maiden efforts of incipient theologians upon the public. On the occasion we are describing the first dissertation was on the subject of "the Propriety of giving a Figurative Interpretation to Passages of Scripture ascribing Personality to the Holy Ghost," and the reader was Henry J. Whitehouse, afterwards Bishop of Illinois. An Anthem by the choir was followed by another dissertation, the audience having evidently been musically refreshed so as to be able to endure a deliverance on "An Examination of the Charge brought against Christianity, that the motives it holds out for the good conduct of life are selfish and mercenary." This was by James Lawlor Yvonnet, and, quite consistently with his subject, in his career he seems to have been "to fortune and

to fame unknown." There being but two members of the Senior Class no more than two dissertations were practicable. The program continued with the Presentment of the first graduating Class by the Faculty to receive their testimonials from the presiding Bishop who gave them an address. More singing followed—five verses of Hymn 56, beginning at the second verse, with the Gloria, concluding devotions by the presiding Bishop and a Voluntary on the organ.

All that sounds fairly familiar. But the great feature of the occasion had occurred before the Commencement proper, viz., the public examination which attracted a number of persons to witness the ordeal which would be trying in these days, but a century ago only gave the full-fledged young theologians a desired opportunity to display their learning. Listen to the words of the reporter. "The very handsome manner in which the young gentlemen acquitted themselves did great credit to the Professors and to *them*." (Mark that, members of the Seminary today.) But listen further. "The Second Class was next examined. It consisted of three, and one of these is, perhaps, as great a prodigy of genius and learning as is to be found in our country. His name is W——; he is between 18 and 19, educated only by a mother, and displaying a store of learning and a splendor of talent, which are truly astonishing. He read a dissertation on the writings of St. Paul, which Bishop White (I understand) remarked 'would do credit to a profound Theologian of 50.' If his health is spared and his thirst for knowledge continues, he will be an ornament to his profession and his country." That was the way we prophesied about our students in 1824. The prodigy in question was Whittingham, afterwards the second to hold the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History and later be-

coming Bishop of Maryland. Possibly the Faculty in this School of the Prophets might be found quite capable of vaticination in such ways today. It would add zest to Commencements if those were foretold who were slated to be Bishops or city Rectors. Yet again all budding theologues are of such remarkable attainments and gifts that such prophecy would leave none for the humbler ranks of the clergy.

A brief announcement in the Philadelphia *Recorder* of July 24, 1824, concerning the Seminary, states that "according to the statutes of this Seminary, the annual examination will take place on Wednesday and Thursday, and the Commencement on Friday," of the following week. Thus early can be traced the statutory practice, abandoned within the memory of a large number of those now living, of examining publicly and orally before a committee appointed by the Trustees, of the students of at least the Senior class in the Seminary. The custom became a most tiresome and trying ordeal for all concerned in the later years of its observance. There must be many who remember with grateful amusement dear Dr. Richey's warning before the day of examination: "Gentlemen, please remember when you are before the examiners to let me do the talking and don't try to say very much yourself"; and mild and gentle Dr. Oliver, Professor of Biblical Exegesis, quietly snubbing a forward examiner who attempted to conduct the examination himself. But in the very early days of Seminary Commencements the public examination was a combined glorification of the learning and scholarly abilities of the students, the erudition of the Bishops and others who assisted as examiners, and a subtle trial of the orthodoxy of the various members of the Faculty.

Thus we read in the account from a Philadelphia Church periodical of 1825 that "on Wednesday the annual examination of the students commenced and was continued from nine o'clock A. M. to three o'clock P. M. of that and the following day. The proficiency of the young men in the various branches of Theological learning was such as to afford the greatest satisfaction, and of consequence to reflect the greatest credit on their able instructors." There were giants in those days, evidently, both among students and Faculty. Not much of such mutual back-patting is found in these latter days. Yet as we shall see presently the back-patting might easily turn into a back-biting, and the unlucky professors were often flayed over the heads of their pupils.

The Commencements of the Seminary gradually moved up town, so far as locality was concerned, passing from Christ Church to St. John's Chapel in Varick Street, and then, so soon as St. Peter's was built, having recourse to its Chapel or Church regularly until the erection of the Chapel of the Good Shepherd.

Among the interesting details of the sixth annual Commencement, in 1828, at St. John's Chapel, is the order of procession and the functionaries taking part, viz., janitor (a survival doubtless of one of the minor orders—the *ostiarius*), students, faculty and librarian, wardens and vestrymen of churches, founders of scholarships, and officers of education and scholarship societies auxiliary to the Seminary, Trustees, Clergy, Bishops—a veritable Procession of the Keys, from the officer who held the key of the Seminary door, to the holders of the keys of learning, the professors and librarian, the holders of the keys of the money bags, the Church Wardens and Founders of Fellowships and Scholarships, through the Trustees who hold the keys of

promotion to the Bishops who hold the keys of heaven. All that was lacking came later when the Commencements were held under the patronage of St. Peter, the original grantee of the Keys of the Kingdom.

And what a wonderful series of Dissertations on Commencement Day was delivered, the subjects being — "The Advantages of Revelation," "The Pre-eminence of the Resurrection of Christ among the Doctrines of the Gospel," "Justification," "The Opinions of the Jews with regard to a Future State," "Whether Mortality was an Original Law of Creation," "The Expediency of a New Translation of the Scriptures." We do not wonder at all, as we muse upon such a wealth and variety of theological research that two years later the Trustees passed a resolution that in future the annual addresses that may be delivered at the Commencements of the Seminary be regularly published under the direction of the Secretary, and that the Church papers often published condensations of these remarkable dissertations. The only point that excites comment and furnishes food for reflection is that these prodigies of learning in 1828 are not heard of later as Bishops or other high officers of the Church.

As an interlude to our consideration of early Commencements a feature of Seminary administration is to be noted which is likely to reduce to despair those who now endeavor to make both financial ends of Seminary running expenses meet. In 1829 we are told that "the students in the General Seminary are boarding for $1.74 per week, or a trifle less than $2, including washing." Two years later a committee of inquiry appointed by the Trustees gives a minutely detailed report of expenses whereby it appears that the average rate of boarding per day was eighteen and seven-eights cents ($.18\frac{7}{8}$), the total expense of boarding during

a period of 272 days was $51.34, and the total expense of each student where two occupied a room was $70.95. Side by side with this amazing expense minimum stands the even more amazing *minimum* in the way of intellectual preparation for applicants for admission to the Seminary who have not the status of Candidates for Orders. Such are required "if they have not been through college, to stand a satisfactory examination by the Faculty on the general principles of Natural and Moral Philosophy, and Rhetoric, and in the Latin and Greek languages, on the following books, or such others as shall be considered an equivalent substitute: Sallust, Virgil's Æneid, Cicero's orations or De Officiis, and the four Gospels, Xenophon's Cyropaedia, and the first three books of Homer." Plain living and high thinking certainly in 1831.

So proceeded without any internal or external commotions the Seminary through the thirties. Apparently the high quality of the public examinations was not maintained, or the examiners were more exacting. Who can wonder that a modest man of the usual type of seminarian, with the eagle eye of his Bishop focussed upon him, and the subtle framing of some difficult question of theology or exegesis by some theological luminary, should perhaps be not quite so fluent and assured as when at ease with his professor or his seminary companions. Hence it need not really disturb us when we read in the report of one committee of Commencement examiners: "Your Committee, while they are prepared to bear testimony as to the favorable results in the case of the class generally, feel it their duty on the other hand to state, that as respects several individuals in the class, the examination has not been so satisfactorily sustained as they could desire. They are constrained also to add that they have been forcibly struck

with what they consider to be defects in the present mode of conducting the examinations. . . . Much allowance no doubt is to be made for the embarrassment under which on occasions like this some young men labor, but this allowance ought not to be extended to cases where the hesitation is such as to oblige the Professor so to vary the questions as almost to suggest the answer."

But between 1840 and 1844 the waters of Seminary life were troubled by more than one storm and Commencements threatened to be endings for members of the Faculty or individual students, if not for the institution. The red rag of popery appeared on the horizon and the alarm cry was sounded.

In the *Churchman* for May 15, 1841, appeared the following news item: "On Thursday, the 6th inst., two of the students of the General Theological Seminary were baptized in the Hudson by the Rev. Professor Ogilby (Professor of Church History). The baptism was by trine immersion, the candidates kneeling in the water with their faces towards the East, and was administered according to the prescribed form of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in the presence of a considerable number of witnesses." It must be remembered that the Hudson River at that time flowed at the Seminary's back-door. This event was not to pass, however, with a mere statement of fact. The *Church Record*, published in Flushing, seized upon the incident and sounded a note of warning from a southern correspondent. "We of the south," declares the writer, "have always been taught to look upon New York churchmanship as the standard of truth and order, (alas! 1814 is not 1919) but we cannot account for this *new movement*, and before we can follow, we must know where we are to be led. (A Daniel come to judgment!) Recent events have served to render

us extremely sensitive and suspicious; for, in the quaint but expressive language of Thomas Fuller, 'When many popish tricks are abroad in the country, if these men meet with a ceremony which is a stranger, especially if it can give but a bad account of itself, no wonder if the watch take it up for one on suspicion.' " The particular grievances seem to have been *trine immersion*, as popish, and *hypothetical baptism* as endangering infant baptism and playing into the hands of the Baptists. "We ask for information," continues the perturbed writer; "this is a dangerous precedent and may lead to greater irregularities; for if the conscience of each scrupulous churchman is allowed to take a wayward course, infant baptism may soon *go under the water* to rise no more."

This reprehensible practice of adult baptism by immersion, with the connivance of a professor, having started the ball rolling, a still further impetus was afforded by the petition of the Seminary students in 1842 asking the Faculty for a weekly Eucharist. The reply signed by Bird Wilson, Dean of the Faculty, is illuminating. He writes, enclosing an extract from the Faculty minutes as follows: "At a meeting of the Faculty of the General Theological Seminary, first of March, 1842, a communication was received from a number of students, requesting that the Holy Communion be administered to them on every Lord's Day in the Seminary Chapel. After due consideration it was resolved that the Faculty deem it *inexpedient* to grant their request."

The following year another bomb exploded in the department of Homiletics, the Chair at that time being held by Benjamin I. Haight. An article printed in a periodical called *The New World* and headed "Puseyism and its Champions," contained the following passage:

"Will the editor of the *Churchman* candidly inform us whether among the sermons written by the students during the last year, and submitted to the Professor of Pastoral Theology there was not one on the Adoration of the Virgin Mary?—and will that professor inform us whether, on being asked why he had offered no objection or administered no reprimand on account of its heretical doctrines, he replied, as he is reported to have done, that his duty was limited to the correction of the style and composition, and did not extend to doctrine? An explanation of this matter is due both to himself and to the Church."

To this interrogation Professor Haight answered: "To each of the above interrogatories I reply distinctly in the *negative*, and declare that the report of which the writer speaks is untrue. To go into detail: first, then, I never saw nor heard a sermon on 'The Adoration of the Virgin Mary,' written by a student of the Seminary. The sermon alluded to by the writer in the *New World* probably was one on 'The Character of the Virgin Mary and the respect due her,' in which the question of her worship was not discussed at all. Second, to a sermon which I never heard nor read, I of course could offer no objections nor 'administer any reprimand for its heretical doctrines.'" The false report was nevertheless widely circulated.

In 1841 considerable excitement was aroused by the perversion to the Roman obedience of a young man who had been resident in the Seminary for two months only, and who when asked if he had examined the points in controversy between us and the Church of Rome, replied: "I do not profess to have done so; I do not attribute my conversion to any intellectual process. . . . I ascribe my conversion to a miraculous interposition of heaven in my favor." He stated also that he owed his conversion, under

God, to reading the *British Critic*. Those acquainted with the history of John Henry Newman will note that this period of the Seminary's history coincides with the time of Newman's restlessness, retirement from Oxford, and ultimate withdrawal from the communion of the English Church.

In 1843 Commencement was marked by the "new mode of celebrating the Seminary Commencements" — making them less of an academic, and more of an ecclesiastical and spiritual character, viz., having the exercises consist of a celebration of the Holy Eucharist, with which were associated the other parts of the Commencement program. The *Churchman* of that date comments upon the changes by saying: "There was much of heartfelt sacred fitness in closing the Seminary year and bidding farewell to the graduating class, under the hallowed influences of the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ." Unhappily this change did not become a traditional custom. Possibly it was at that time considered popish.

In the year 1843-44 allegations as to the unsoundness of Seminary teaching and the Romish practices of certain students increased. Students were alleged to be guilty of having "adopted sentiments on some points which, if not decidedly Romish, were so nearly allied to Romish notions, as to render it impossible to distinguish between them — that they were in the daily practice of invoking the Virgin Mary, that they professed to believe in the decrees of the Council of Trent, and that one at least had visited and conferred with Bishop Hughes" (then R. C. Bishop of New York). The incidents connected with the ordination of Mr. Arthur Carey (the memorial tablet to whose memory now hangs in the anteroom of the Chapel) added much fuel to the flame. The Trustees voted that, in the examination

of the students, the Committee be requested to direct the examination, particularly of the Senior Class, to the "points in controversy between us and the Church of Rome" and "to the distinctive principles of the Church." But at length the pressure of attack, allegation, and criticism became so strong that the Board of Trustees determined to make a thorough investigation of the teaching of all departments of Seminary instruction and of the opinions held by the students. Undoubtedly that method only can deal to the satisfaction of all concerned with attacks and criticisms to which such an institution as the Seminary is recurrently liable. Three of the Professors, as a matter of principle, declined to appear before the Committee appointed by the Trustees, declaring that any selection of members of the Faculty was invidious. One Professor, Dr. Ogilby, holding the Chair of Ecclesiastical History, positively refused to answer any questions.

The Seminary approached the conclusion of its first quarter century, in 1844, with a twofold charge against it, of being popish on the one hand and on the other of not being Catholic. The Commencement of that year then was of more than usual interest. The Committee on Examinations reported to the Trustees that "the whole tone of the questions put by the professors and of the answers of the students indicated an entire conformity of sentiment and opinion with the standards of the Protestant Episcopal Church." The Trustees continued the Committee of investigation which shortly after reported exonerating completely Faculty and students from the allegations of "Romish tendencies in the instructions of the institution, whether public or private." The friends of the Seminary were in "entire unanimity" in perfect willingness that the most thorough and searching investigation should be made, con-

fident that neither *Popery*, nor anything approximating to it, has ever found a lodgement within its precincts.

More significant still, however, and bringing at a leap the Seminary of 1844 into touch with the Seminary of 1919 on a crucial point was the sermon preached before the Missionary Association of the students, in the Church of the Ascension, by the Rev. Dr. Tyng, who was of the most straitest family of liberals a liberal in theology. The Church reporter characterizes the sermon as remarkable both for the public avowal and the occasion selected for giving it utterance. The present writer, as the successor in the Chair of History to Onderdonk, Whittingham, Ogilby, Mahan, Seymour, and Richey, echoes the words of the preacher seventy-five years ago, with entire approval as in accord with the continuous teaching of Church History during a hundred years of Seminary life. Dr. Tyng declares that "he was satisfied, from actual experiment, that the attempt to conciliate dissenters by concession on the subject of the nature and authority of the Church, and of the ministry, was worse than useless, and that for one, he forever abandoned it."

Thus in the first twenty-five years of its history, the General Theological Seminary is exhibited maintaining well and staunchly the sober tradition of principles which safeguard against aberrations from Catholic truth, while not hampering the fulness and enrichment of life in the Church of Christ.

The Sources of the Coverdale Bible

By Rev. E. De S. Juny.

ATTENTION has often been called to the fact that in the Dedication of the Coverdale Bible the translator does not claim to have translated directly from the original languages but to have availed himself of help derived from "fyve sundry interpreters," and accordingly the title page bears the inscription, "faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe." Who were the five interpreters? The most cursory comparison reveals many striking verbal coincidences between the English Bible and the Latin Vulgate. Quite as numerous are its resemblances to the phraseology of Luther's German version. Further investigation proves that many peculiar renderings in the English Bible find their counterpart in the Latin version of Pagninus. Some years ago Dr. Ginnsburg in his commentary on Ecclesiastes proved that a well-nigh forgotten version published at Zurich in 1531 is the source from which Coverdale derived many a characteristic turn of thought and expression. But the fifth source has remained undetermined. Some writers on the subject have conjectured that it must be the English of Tindale; others, that it is the Anabaptist Bible printed at Worms in 1529; others, the notes of Rudelius in an edition of the Vulgate printed at Cologne in 1527. It seems never to have occurred to previous investigators that Coverdale really meant *Dutch* when he used that word on his title page; or, to speak more accurately, that he included both High and Low German under the general term "Douche." The present writer has collated Coverdale's version with two of the early Dutch versions and has discovered resemblances

which prove conclusively an indebtedness to this source; nay more, that in countless instances where he seems to have used Luther's version or the Vulgate he may really have used the Dutch versions of Liesvelt and Vosterman.

Myles Coverdale was born in the year 1488. He studied philosophy and theology at the University of Cambridge, and was ordained priest in 1514. About the same time he entered the convent of Austin Friars at Cambridge of which the unfortunate Robert Barnes became Prior in 1523. Ever inclined to follow the leadership of a stronger mind, he became one of Barnes' most zealous assistants in the propagation of the Lutheran opinions which were then gaining ground in England. Early in the year 1526, when Barnes was arraigned for heresy, Coverdale accompanied him to London and acted as his secretary during the period of his trial and imprisonment. When Barnes escaped to the Low Countries, Coverdale, who had now thrown off his friar's habit and become a secular priest, also left England for the same destination, though he does not seem to have continued his association with his former mentor but to have chosen new guides and a new line of endeavor.

Some years previously he had gained the notice of Sir Thomas More and of Thomas Cromwell, both of whom were destined to become prominent in the history of those troublous times. Through them his attention seems to have been directed toward biblical study and translation, as may be learned from an undated letter to Cromwell which he must have written while yet at Cambridge, since it is subscribed "from the Augustines" and signed "Frere Myles Coverdale." Little is known of his movements and employments during the next few years. An oft-quoted passage in Foxe's "Actes and Monuments" asserts that he met Tindale by appointment at Hamburg and helped him in

translating the Pentateuch from Easter to December, anno 1529, in the house of a worshipful widow Mistress Margaret van Emmerson. There is also documentary evidence that he lived for some time at Antwerp where he was employed or maintained by a wealthy citizen named Jacob van Meteren while engaged in translating the Bible into English.

It is probable that Coverdale was little acquainted with either "Douche" or Hebrew when, towards the end of the year 1527, he forsook his native land and took refuge in the Low Countries. But there he encountered people who used a dialect so similar to his own vernacular that soon he could read their books and take part in their conversation without great difficulty. Beginning the work of translation, he found ready to his hand two Low Dutch versions which had recently aroused great interest in that region. The first of these was not an independent translation but a "combined Bible" printed by Jacob van Liesvelt at Antwerp in 1526. The term *combined Bible* may perhaps need explanation.

Martin Luther published his translation of the New Testament in 1522. He then turned his attention to the Old Testament, and the first instalment of his translation—Genesis to the end of Solomon's Song—was published at Wittenberg in 1524. Luther's great reputation throughout central Europe caused his translation to be eagerly sought by all classes of society, and enterprising publishers hastened to reproduce it in combination with parts of the versions current in their various localities. An early instance of such combination is this Low Dutch Bible printed by Liesvelt in 1526. It substitutes *is* for *ist*, *end* for *und*, *niet* for *nicht*, and makes other verbal changes of a dialectic character; but it is evidently a close reproduc-

tion of Luther's version, so far as the latter had gone, *combined* with such portions of existing Low Dutch versions as were necessary to complete the scriptural canon, and adapted to the liguistic usages of Antwerp. Living in this city and lacking time as yet to have learned High Dutch (which does not resemble English so closely as Low Dutch does), Coverdale would naturally have used the Liesvelt Bible rather than Luther's version in its original form as printed at Wittenberg in 1524. The same conclusion must be regarded as clearly indicated by numerous passages in which Coverdale's phraseology accords with Liesvelt's a little more closely that with Luther's. Thus Ps. 3^{8}, *upon the chekebone*, would seem to be derived from Liesvelt, *op die Kinnebachen*, rather than from Luther, *auff den backen;* Ps. 68^{14}, *Yf so be that ye lye amonge the pales*, from Liesvelt, *Ift dat ghi light tusschen die palen*, rather than from Luther, *Wenn yhr light zwisschen den grentzen;* and the great prevalence of the auxiliary *shall* would seem due to the fact that Liesvelt uses *sal* in many places where Luther uses *will* or *wird*. Indeed, a large majority of the English expressions which have hitherto been ascribed to a Lutheran origin would seem more immediately derived from Liesvelt, those only being directly traceable to Luther which find a counterpart in the *complete* version revised and published by him in 1534, which differs from that previously published by him in separate instalments as much as the English Revised Version of 1885 differs from the King James Version.

The other Low Dutch version was printed at Antwerp in 1528 by William Vorsterman. It differs materially from its predecessor for the reason that it is a translation of the Vulgate corrected by a comparison with the Hebrew. Its derivation is evident in every verse. Where the Vul-

gate varies from the Hebrew, Vorsterman follows the former but gives a translation of the latter as a marginal note. Coverdale's use of this version is not only probable in itself but is also susceptible of proof by many citations, and in countless instances where his phraseology resembles that of the Vulgate it bears an equal or even greater resemblance to Vorsterman's.

To illustrate this statement, take the opening words of the Book of Psalms, *Blessed is the man.* Vosterman has, *Salich is die man;* the Vulgate has *Beatus vir,* without verb or article expressed, while Liesvelt has *Wel hem,* following Luther *Wol dem* (literally, *Good for him*). One of the most striking differences between the English Versions of 1535 and 1611 is that where the latter uses the expression *the wicked,* the former has *the ungodly;* in such passages the Vulgate generally has *iniquus* while Liesvelt and Luther have *der Gottlos,* but Vosterman has *die ongodlike,* and when it is remembered that the termination *ly* is an abbreviation of *like* the source of Coverdale's most characteristic word becomes absolutely certain.

Again, the King James Version (following the Masoretic division of the Psalms which differs from that of the Septuagint and the Vulgate) begins the tenth Psalm with the words, *Why standest, etc.;* Coverdale's version makes no division here, but continues under the head of Psalm IX, inserting a note, *Here the Hebrues begynne the X psalme.* It is more than a coincidence that Vorsterman also makes no division here and has the note, *Hier beginnet in thebrues den X psalm.* Psalm 14 in the King James Version has only seven verses, omitting three verses which are inserted in the Septuagint and the Vulgate between verse 3 and verse 4 but do not appear in the Masoretic text; Coverdale's version inserts these three verses and their wording

closely resembles the corresponding insertion in Vorsterman.

In Ps. 29[5] King James has *the cedars* but Coverdale has *the Cedre trees;* Vorsterman has *dye cedar boomen,* but the Vulgate and Luther leave the word for *trees* to be implied. In Ps. 74[9] King James has *our signs* but Coverdale, *our tokens;* Vorsterman has *onse teekenen,* Luther has *unser zeichen,* and Vulgate has *signa nostra.* In Ps. 85[12] King James has *shall yield* but Coverdale *shal geve;* Vorsterman has *sal geven,* while Luther uses the present tense and Vulgate *dabit* would naturally be rendered *will* rather than *shall.* In Ps. 106[20] King James has *of an ox that eateth gras* but Coverdale, *of a calfe that eateth hay;* Vorsterman has *eens calfs* (genitive case) *dat hoy ettet,* while Luther has *eines ochsen der gras isset,* and the words of the Vulgate bear no resemblance to the English words. In Ps. 109[2] King James has *with a lying tongue* but Coverdale, *with false tonges;* Vorsterman has *met valscen tongen* (plural), while both Luther and the Vulgate use a singular noun. In Ps. 132[17] King James has *a lamp* but Coverdale, *a lanterne;* Vorsterman has *een lateerne,* Vulgate has *lucernam,* and Luther has *eine leuchte.* In each verse of Ps. 136 Coverdale inserts *endureth;* Vorsterman inserts *duret,* while Luther inserts *währet,* and the Vulgate leaves the verb to be implied.

All of these citations are from the Psalms, merely because a collation of the Psalms happens to be at hand. Similar examples are to be found in every Book of the Old Testament, and the number of them might be increased indefinitely. Internal evidence proves without shadow of doubt that Coverdale used the Vulgate during the whole period of his labors and that he also used the complete and revised Lutheran version published in 1534—early enough

for him to have availed himself of its assistance in a final revision of his work while it was going through the press in 1535. But the same evidence proves no less indubitably that in a vast number of instances in which he is generally supposed to have followed Luther or the Vulgate he may really have followed the Low Dutch versions of Liesvelt and Vorsterman. It may be asserted positively that the "fyve sundry interpreters" which Coverdale "faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe" are:

1. The Latin Vulgate.
2. The Latin Version of Pagninus published in 1527.
3. The Low Dutch Version of Vorsterman.
4. The High Dutch Version of Luther—indirectly as it appears in the combined Bible of Liesvelt and directly in the revised edition of 1534.
5. The Swiss Dutch Version published at Zurich in 1531.

BOOK REVIEWS

Mater Christi. Meditations on our Lady. By Mother St. Paul. Longmans, Green & Co. London, 1919.

These meditations deal with all that is known or can be inferred about the Blessed Virgin, from her birth to the Assumption. With the painstaking reverence of a devout Roman Catholic religious, they are dramatized in detail. With the purpose and love that animates them we are in entire sympathy; but we must demur when such impulses carry the writer beyond the confines of probability, beyond and contrary to the proportion of the faith. It is good to be able to touch the garments of the Lord, but not to embroider thereupon the network of unbalanced inference. Each meditation ends with a "Spiritual Bouquet"; and it would seem that they are culled, not from the sweet flowers of the field, which bloom naturally; but from exotic and strange growths which do not flourish in the sunshine and pure air of natural devotion. For example, of the visitation we read: "John the Baptist, yet unborn, *under-*

stands the salutation, and leaps to adore his God; and at that moment Jesus, Whose work on earth has already begun, cleanses His Forerunner from the stain of original sin." Of the *Salve Regina* Mother St. Paul says: "And with our cries are joined those of other banished children whose cry 'How long!' is ever ascending to Heaven. It is their Mother Mary whom they long to see; for as the term of each one's banishment expires, she it is who comes to open the gate and bring them to the 'better country' which they have so long desired." "How shall we sing in a strange land? It is possible by keeping in touch with Mary." One of the joys of angels is "Seeing the great Intercessor at her work praying for sinners, in whom they take such an interest."

The colloquy on Mary's death includes this: "Who is letting me do all my work close to her side; and who will be there at the hour of my death, to put me back into the Hands of her Son; . . . for it is impossible for a child of Mary to be lost."

Father Joseph Rickaby, S. J., writes a preface which extols our Lord as the Teacher of all nations. He says: "These Meditations are composed on the Ignatian plan of visualizing what Our Lord did, said, and suffered." Unless our Lord's name is a slip of the printer, Fr. Rickaby having intended the name of Mary, we can hardly understand how he could have read the book! P. R. F.

The Consuming Fire. By Harris Elliott Kirk, D.D. The Macmillan Company.

This is an exceedingly able and interesting demonstration of the Prophet Isaiah's conception of God as active, dynamic holiness—an atmosphere of fire, burning round men and nations and things. Assyria was doomed because she was unreal; Germany failed because she could not live in the fire which consumes everything opposite to herself. The Allied nations, as Judah of old, have been permitted to survive because there was in those peoples an indestructible deposit of moral reality. The author rightly says that "modern indifference to religion has been due in great measure to ignorance of God's nature; for without belief in the holy significance of life, it is not worth while to talk about a Saviour."

We are inclined to believe that in these times of readjustment no better discipline for our statesmen and diplomats could be suggested than a thorough study of Isaiah and his world as indicated in the work before us.

W. H. B.

Convent Life. The Meaning of a Religious Vocation. By Martin J. Scott, S. J. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1919.

This is an excellent description of convent life, its aims, conditions; and the particular kinds of work undertaken by the different orders and communities of the Roman Catholic Church. In the chapter on the teaching sisterhoods the author quotes "a high Protestant authority" ("Bishop Burgess of the Episcopal Church"), "a very remarkable acknowledgment coming from a non-Catholic professor" ("Mr. Ralph Adams Cram"), and a plea for moral training by "Bishop Greer of the Protestant Episcopal Church"—all supporting the truth of the necessity for moral and religious education. It is pleasant to be quoted as seeing the good done by Roman Catholic religious in education, but not in such a manner as to imply that such testimony is wrung from us contrary to our ordinary judgment or the principles of our Church. P. R. F.

The Virgin Birth of Our Lord. By the Rev. Leonard Prestige, M.A. London: Robert Scott & Co., 1918.

Why are Catholic Christians so insistent in maintaining the Virgin Birth of our Lord against the repeated attacks of hostile critics? Why lay so much stress on what, after all, is only a subordinate clause of the Creed? It is surely possible to recognize the deity of Jesus Christ without it. Why not, while accepting for ourselves the probable truth of the statement, allow to others "freedom of faith" to reject it? Of course, the Virgin Birth seems to be explicitly taught by two of the evangelists, but the other two do not mention it, nor does St. Paul in any of his burning epistles instruct his converts concerning it. Why not be content with "the Christmas message," without enquiring too closely into the historicity of the charming legends which have gathered around it? Above all, why make it a part of the confession of faith required of everyone who desires to be baptized into the Christian Church? Why brand as unorthodox or as false to their ordination vows those clergy who are unwilling or unable to affirm its literal truth?

Perhaps one might answer, Yankee fashion, with another series of questions? Why should the assaults on this particular doctrine be so frequent, so persistent, so bitter? If it be but a minor matter, why should it cause such great concern and call forth so many and such ingenious treatises from learned opponents? Why, if it be a part of the Creed—the ancient formulation of the Christian faith, the origin of

which antedates the formation of the canon of Holy Scripture itself—why should not the humble disciple accept it with the same simplicity and whole-heartendness that he accepts the remainder? Why, if two of the gospels set it forth in detail, should we question it because it does not happen to be recorded in the other two? If they differ in everything else and yet agree on the fact itself, is it not clear that we have the double assurance of two really independent traditions? The author of the Fourth Gospel was certainly acquainted with the gospels of Matthew and Luke and he has not hesitated to correct, or at least remove, the obscurities of these earlier narratives; why then, if he doubted the Virgin Birth, does he not say so? St. Luke was a companion and disciple of St. Paul; it is not at all impossible that the Apostle himself read the first draft of the gospel; is it really probable that Luke here goes widely apart from his master and that "Paul knew nothing" of the Virgin Birth? St. Paul mentions the eucharist in only one of his thirteen extant epistles; he *may* have dwelt on the significance of the Virgin Birth in a fourteenth now lost. How much of "the Christmas message" will be left, if we dismiss the opening chapters of the First and Third Gospels as unworthy of credence? No court will admit to naturalization the alien who refuses assent to the political principles which lie at the foundation of our governmental system, and why should we be denounced as bigoted if we demand an honest acceptance of the Creed? To profess allegiance to the state and yet plot for its overthrow is called by the ugly name of treason. Shall we have a milder title for the offense of those who privately repudiate the faith they publicly declare? "Freedom of thought" and "freedom of speech" are fine phrases if they are not used to cover real disloyalty.

The book we have under review is one of that excellent series of "Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice" with which we trust our readers are well acquainted, and it bids fair to be not the least useful of their number. The writer begins by going over the evidence with patient care, and succeeds in giving it fresh interest and force, even where little that is new can be said. He once more makes clear not only that the Infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke assert on the surface that Jesus Christ was born of a virgin, but also that their testimony cannot be robbed of its completeness by either textual or literary criticism. Even if it be false witness its purport is unmistakable; it may be disbelieved, but it cannot be explained away. The usual objections are examined and reference is made to the archæological discoveries of Ramsay and others

which have gone far in corroborating the trustworthiness of St. Luke. It would have been better, we think, if the Oxyrrhyncus and other like documents had been quoted at length, for the benefit of those whose libraries contain only the older commentaries. The "silence" of St. Paul and St. John and the statements of the early fathers are briefly discussed. The author then takes up in turn the three chief—and mutually destructive—hypotheses which have been framed by its assailants to account for the undoubted belief of the early Church, and he shows, as conclusively as may be in the narrow limits of the two chapters devoted to this subject, their total inadequacy. Here indeed, in the inability of the opponents of the Christian doctrine to give any satisfactory explanation for its general and primitive acceptance, is one of the strongest defenses of the Faith, and it might have received greater emphasis.

There is an interesting and valuable chapter on the "Doctrine of the Virgin Birth," and in this he discusses the relation of this doctrine to that of the Incarnation. He points out that the supernatural fact of the sinless man demands a supernatural entrance into the world, and that the Virgin Birth is necessary to the single personality. The Incarnation means that God united Himself to Man, not to a man, as would have been the case if Jesus had been born in ordinary fashion of Joseph and Mary. It was not that a man became God, but that God became Man.

The "Epilogue" deals with the real point at issue, and recognizes that the question is not in fact one of evidence but of the underlying presuppositions which make it possible or impossible to accept evidence. The Virgin Birth is a miracle and its opponents are not disposed to accept miracle. They are under the dominion of physical science and of its dogma of the uniformity of nature. At bottom they are deistic and materialistic in their philosophy. However honestly many among them may profess a belief in the Incarnation they are actually thinking of our Lord as the highest development of man rather than as the manifestation of God. They would limit God to the methods He has observed in the physical universe. They do not see that the progressive development of God's creation culminated in the entrance into the created world of Very God and thereby at once new conditions were set up and a new law came into action—even as new conditions arose and new laws came into operation at the entrance of conscious and self-determining life. It is the uniqueness of the entry of God into the world that required the uniqueness of the manner of that entry. It is because God was in Christ, in a

way as well as in a degree beyond that of His presence in any of the ordinary sons of men, that it was not only fitting but necessary that His Birth should not be as that of an ordinary son of man.

CHARLES CARROLL EDMUNDS.

The Faith by Which We Live. By the Rt. Rev. Charles Fiske, D.D., LL.D., Bishop Coadjutor of Central New York. Morehouse Publishing Co., 1919.

Bishop Fiske, who has before now been compared to Fr. Walter Carey, has again produced an admirable book. There is one notable difference, however, between the Bishop Coadjutor of Central New York and the militant naval chaplain who stirred the Anglican world with his "Standard of Revolt" three years ago in the *Church Times,* and has gone on pouring out his excellent books since. That is, while Fr. Carey seems in his last two volumes to be tiring and to have lost that fine edge of freshness which commended his work at once upon its very first appearance, Bishop Fiske's work seems to increase in charm and quality as his pen grows the more facile with frequent expression.

This substantial book (xii-322 pp.) is much more than a summary of the tenets of the Christian Religion; it is more than a manual of instruction in the Christian Faith; it is a clear-cut, non-technical, easily read exposition of just what its title claims, The Faith by Which We Live, and the best of it is that it is so obviously the product of a personality which is formed upon and in that faith and that religion. The thirty-four chapters are of nearly uniform length, and their subjects run the gamut of our religion. It is a compendium, an introduction (in the technical sense of the word), and a *vade mecum* for the layman. Bishop Fiske possesses in marked and well-recognized degree the faculty of speaking to the plain man, — and he is legion. The reviewer especially commends the book for use among lay readers. With only very slight adaptation, the various chapters, read to congregations ministered to by a reader would undoubtedly serve well to deepen the faith and enlarge the understanding of such congregations. H. S. W.